



SECTION 3: General Policies and Procedures

American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics.....	3
Annual Faculty Planning and Evaluation Report.....	5
Annual Program Assessment.....	6
Search & Appointment Policies for Tenure-Track Faculty.....	7
Appointment, Reappointment, Rank, and Tenure Policy.....	9
File Preparation Recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion	38
ARRT Expedited Guide Template	47
Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor	49
Professor Emeritus Designation and Eligibility Criteria	50
ARRT Appeals Process.....	51
6.3 Appointment, Support, and Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty.....	57
Attendance at SOLES and Department/Program Meetings.....	58
Budget Process	58
Center for Educational Excellence.....	59
SOLES Committee Assignments 2014-2015.....	60
School of Leadership and Education Sciences	60
University-Wide Committees 2014-2015	60
Structure and Responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee.....	62
Evaluation of Supervisors	67
The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)	67
Grants	69
Grant Preparation, Pre-Award	70

Faculty Research Grants	72
SOLES Global Faculty Grants.....	77
Institutional Review Board (IRB) Proposals.....	79
IRB Proposal Preparation Guide.....	79
International Course Proposals	90
Faculty Load Policy	91
Load Forms.....	91
Merit Pay Process	91
Mileage Reimbursement.....	92
New Academic Initiatives.....	93
Non-tenured Faculty Voting in SOLES Meetings	93
Practicum & Fieldwork Compensation.....	93
Sabbatical Leave.....	95
Disabilities.....	95
Standards for Graduate Students.....	98
Travel Allotment Procedures.....	100
Faculty Presenting with Students at Conferences.....	101
Travel Guidelines	101
University Professorships.....	105
University Senate.....	107
University Policies.....	108

American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics

<http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>

The statement which follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by the Association's Committee on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Association's Council in June 1987, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting.

INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and the Committee on Professional Ethics, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

THE STATEMENT

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self- discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
2. As teacher, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.
3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
4. As member of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effects of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the

impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Annual Faculty Planning and Evaluation Report

Directions for Completing the Annual Faculty Planning and Evaluation Report:

The Annual Faculty Planning and Evaluation Report is a tool used to help initiate planning and assessing progress toward the accomplishments of faculty members' objectives for the calendar year in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. These forms can be accessed through the SOLES website: <http://www.sandiego.edu/soles/gateways/faculty-and-staff/handbooks-policies-forms.php#policies>

At the beginning of the calendar year (January/February), each faculty member will meet with the Dean, Associate Dean or Department Chair individually to set objectives for that year. Sections I, II, III, and IV of the document should be completed and submitted prior to the meeting with the Dean. Additional information may be added to subsequent pages but it is not required.

The purpose of this meeting is to "plan" for the future. For example, in Section I which asks you to list courses for each semester, in January you will not know how many students are enrolled, so it is not necessary to fill the information in. However, in the end of the year meeting, all course enrollments must be included.

In December, each faculty member will once again meet with the Dean, Associate Dean or Department Chair to assess accomplishments of the objectives previously set forth. The entire document should be completed and submitted at least one day prior to that meeting. There are various ways to complete the document. Some faculty revisit the planning document and make changes in bold if certain objectives changed. For example, if you taught a different course from what you had originally listed in the planning meeting, you could put an explanation in bold as to why your teaching assignment changed. For non-tenured faculty, this document could assist you as you organize and update your Promotion and Tenure file.

A digital copy of the planning and evaluation document should be sent to the Dean's assistant at the end of each year so they can be stored in a central location (the Dean's Office).

Annual Program Assessment

All programs in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences complete an annual assessment cycle by using faculty determined methods to measure program and student learning outcomes. Facilitated by the Director of Assessment, every program establishes and publishes program and student learning outcomes, outlined in a curriculum map that shows appropriate points in the program for assessing candidate development. Assessment plans and findings are collected and stored, with the aid of the SOLES Office of Assessment, using the University's Assessment Management System – TRAC DAT (see sample data below). Faculty, staff, and administrators are able to generate assessment reports for decision making regarding accreditation, pedagogy, curriculum, assessment processes, or program efficacy.

Sample of Assessment Plan and Results Collected and Stored in TRAC DAT

Unit Assessment Report -University of San Diego Program (SOLES-GR) – Counseling MA

Student Learning Outcome 3:

Counseling candidates will utilize theories, models, research evidence, and practice strategies related to human growth and development; including the social, cultural, and societal influences on the life stages.

Assessment Measures 3:

01. Counseling candidates are assessed in COUN 505 using their *Developmental Study Paper*.
02. COUN practicum/fieldwork students are assessed on their ability to utilize theories, models, and strategies related to human growth and development; including the social, cultural, and societal influences on the life stages using practicum evaluation items pertaining to *Human Growth and Development*.
03. Counseling graduating students are assessed using selected items in the USD-SOLES Exit Survey which relate to *Human Growth and Development*.

Assessment Criterion 3:

01. 85% of the COUN 505 students will earn at least a B on their *Developmental Study Paper*.
02. COUN practicum/fieldwork students will have advanced to an average cohort rubric score of at least 4 (using a 5-point scale) on practicum evaluation items pertaining to the application of counseling theories and strategies related to *Human Growth and Development* of diverse clients.
03. Counseling graduating students will indicate with a rating score of at least 4 (using a 5-point scale) on selected USD-SOLES Exit Survey items relating to *Human Growth and Development*.

Assessment Results 3:

01. 100% (19 of 19) of the COUN 505 students earned at least a B on their *Developmental Study Paper*.
02. The Spring 2013 mean cohort rubric score for practicum evaluation items pertaining to the application of counseling theories and strategies related to *Human Growth and Development* of diverse clients was in the desired 4 to 5 range (using a 5-point scale). [Practicum evaluation items 4, 5, 10-13, 23, 28, 32, & 33 were used.] **The overall mean for the ten items was 4.6**
03. Counseling graduating students indicated ratings of at least 4 (using a 5-point scale) on selected USD-SOLES Exit Survey items relating to *Human Growth and Development*. Students rated all 7 items with mean ratings in the desired 4 to 5 range for 2013. [Exit Survey items 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.6, 11.8, 11.12, & 11.13 were used. The first number refers to the table # in the report and the second number is the item in that table.] **The overall mean for the seven items was 4.7.**

Search & Appointment Policies for Tenure-Track Faculty

The goal of the School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES) is to recruit and select highly qualified faculty committed to the mission of the University. Candidates for appointment will display an understanding of the central role of SOLES at USD and an appreciation of the teacher / scholar model. SOLES is committed to University policies regarding equal opportunity in its hiring practices. The hiring of faculty in SOLES encompasses a series of phases that are outlined below.

Approval

The appointment process begins when the Department Chair, in consultation with the program faculty, seeks budgetary support for a new or replacement faculty position. To request a position, the program must show a demonstrated need for the position within the existing program, or for new initiatives within the program. The Chair completes an "Authorization to Recruit" form; and forwards the form to the dean for approval. Once approved at the school level, the Dean secures the Provost's signature.

Forming the Search Committee

After asking for nominations, the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, appoints a search committee chair. In most cases the chair will be a tenured faculty member in the program.

In forming the committee, the Dean and Chair will consider factors such as gender and ethnic diversity, program representation, content expertise, length of service, etc. A minimum of four people, including the chair, will be invited to serve on the committee. At least two committee members will be tenure track faculty from the program area and one committee member will be from outside the program area. When appropriate, clinical faculty may be asked to serve on a search committee. All search committees will have a student representative.

Section 3 - 6

Recruitment and Application

The search committee will prepare a job description and distribute it to all departmental faculty. The search committee chair will review the items provided in the [Faculty Recruitment and Retention Toolkit](#). In keeping with SOLES' commitment to diversity, the committee chair will invite the Associate Provost for Inclusion and Diversity to the first search committee meeting. The chair will then send a job announcement and an invitation to apply directly to qualified scholars.

The chair will work with the administrative assistant for the department to ensure that applications are logged and appropriate letters are sent to applicants. The chair will advise all candidates of the status of their application materials (i.e., whether all references and supporting documents have been received in a timely manner.) All applications are submitted electronically through the university's "I-Recruitment" system. (Human Resources oversees this process.)

The search committee will report to the Dean on the qualities of the candidate pool once it has been narrowed to a top group of at least three candidates. Permission to interview finalists will be given by the Dean; usually three finalists will be invited to campus. Prior to the invitation for an interview, every effort will be made by the search committee to call references and, if possible, pre-interview potential finalists. If done at a regional or national conference, the Provost's office and/or Dean's office will fund one member of the search committee to attend the conference. Finalists should be sent links to the following electronic documents:

- 1) A Graduate Bulletin and Undergraduate Bulletin (if applicable);
- 2) Department brochures;
- 3) The ARRT policy; and
- 4) Information about benefits, including housing information.

Interview Phase

Interviews and meetings on campus should include at least the following:

- 1) A classroom presentation to students and faculty;
- 2) A research presentation to students and faculty;
- 3) An interview with the Dean who will discuss primarily the ARRT policy and procedures; salary range and start-up funds (if applicable);
- 4) An interview with the Department Chair;
- 5) An interview with the search committee; and,
- 6) Group or individual interviews with faculty.

All individuals involved in interviewing candidates will be asked to complete a "candidate evaluation form." The committee will include these forms as another data point for selecting and prioritizing candidates for the position. In addition to soliciting written feedback from as many constituent groups as possible, the chair will arrange an open meeting for all SOLES faculty in order to ask questions and voice opinions.

Appointment Phase

The committee will not rank order the candidates. Instead, the committee chair will provide the Dean with a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of each acceptable candidate. This analysis should be given to the Dean as soon as possible after the final candidate has completed the interview process.

Conditions of appointment for a candidate will be put in writing to the candidate by the Dean at the time of the contract after consultation with the Department Chair. It is the expectation of SOLES that new faculty will have a terminal degree at the time of the start of the appointment. In circumstances in which this is not the case, the Dean shall set forth in the letter of appointment a deadline for completion of the terminal degree.

The Chair will ensure that all candidates who are not offered the position will be informed that they are no longer candidates. (See Faculty Recruitment Handbook for sample letters.)

If a candidate is eligible to enter at a rank higher than Assistant Professor and/or if tenure is a condition for appointment, SOLES ARRT Committee will vote on these matters. The majority of ARRT must support the recommended rank and tenure level.

Faculty grievances with regard to a particular appointment recommendation, or the appointment process as used in a particular case will be addressed initially by the Dean, unless the grievance involves the Dean in which case it will be addressed by the Provost. If the grievances remain unresolved, they will be addressed by the President, who will make a final determination.

*Approved at the 2/5/03 Faculty meeting
Updated 9/30/13*

Appointment, Reappointment, Rank, and Tenure Policy

**School of Leadership and Education Sciences
University of San Diego**

Approved by SOLES Faculty May 16, 2007

I. THE FACULTY'S ROLE IN RANK AND TENURE DECISIONS

The University of San Diego maintains the quality of its faculty through objective and thorough appraisal by competent faculty members of each candidate for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The Rank and Tenure Committee of each school or college is given primary responsibility for this appraisal. Each Committee will include the school or college Dean as a voting member. The Committee's functions include the recognition and encouragement of each candidate's achievements (USD, 4.2.1, p.1).

II. THE COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY is essential to the Committee's deliberations and recommendations. Committee members, and others with whom it is essential for the Committee to consult, must maintain confidentiality in all written and oral communications concerning the appraisal of candidates (USD, 4.2.2, p.2).
- B. The Committee should strive for promptness and dispatch in the performance of its duties, consistent with judicious and thorough consideration of each case (USD, 4.2.2, p.2).

- C. The Committee shall assess the evidence provided to it. If in the Committee's judgment the evidence is insufficient to permit it to make a clear recommendation to the President, the Committee's chair will request amplification from the candidate or from the recommending Department Chair or Dean (USD, 4.2.2, p.2).
- D. Recommendations of the Committee form the basis of action by the President. The Committee's recommendation will include a statement of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable. Favorable recommendations require a two-thirds positive vote of Committee members present at the meeting when the vote is taken, with the additional requirement that the favorable votes constitute at least a simple majority of the possible votes of the total Committee membership (USD, 4.2.2, p.2).
- E. The Committee will report its vote to the President. If its decision is not unanimous, the Committee's report may include separate concurring or dissenting opinions (USD, 4.2.2, p.3).
- F. After notification of the President's decision, the Committee will send the candidate a copy of its recommendation and accompanying rationale (or summary of report) made to the President (USD, 4.2.2, p.3).
- G. In May, the outgoing ARRT Committee Chair will review USD and SOLES policy changes from the previous year and update the SOLES appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion document as needed (SOLES 5/16/07).
- H. The Chair of the ARRT Committee will ensure that minutes of ARRT Committee meetings are recorded, approved by the Committee with any corrections noted, and maintained in the Dean's office (SOLES 5/16/07).
- I. The ARRT Committee will hold an annual meeting for tenure-track faculty members in order to review submission procedures and guidelines, and to answer any questions related to the ARRT review process (SOLES 5/5/10).

III. ARRT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

- A. The ARRT committee shall be composed of six tenured SOLES faculty members representing each of the three departments, two at-large positions, and the SOLES Dean. Two elected, non-tenured faculty members will be

present for policy meetings only. Tenured faculty representatives are elected to two-year staggered terms on the ARRT Committee. The Department of School, Family, and Mental Health Professions and two at-large representatives start their terms during academic years that begin in even-numbered years. The Leadership, and Learning and Teaching representatives start their terms in academic years that begin during odd-numbered years. Separate ballots will be used for electing each representative. Candidates for tenure and promotion are not eligible to serve on the committee in a year they file for tenure and/or promotion (SOLES 10/3/2000, SOLES 4/4/2012).

- B. The ARRT Committee for the following academic year will be elected at the May SOLES faculty meeting. At that time, the September ARRT meeting will be scheduled (SOLES 3/10/04).
- C. The Chair of the ARRT Committee will be elected by the members of the Committee at the May SOLES meeting. The Dean may not serve as Chair of the ARRT Committee (SOLES 3/10/04).

IV. ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION

- A. In general, an Assistant Professor is eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor no sooner than the tenure decision year. With limited exceptions, the rank of Associate Professor is conferred only upon faculty members who have earned the terminal degree in their field. Faculty hired before September, 1997, may elect to be considered for promotion pursuant to the version of this paragraph in effect in the rules approved by the Board of Trustees (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).
- B. In general, an Associate Professor is eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor after a minimum of five years of full-time service as Associate Professor, at least two years of which are spent at the University. The rank of Professor requires that significantly greater expertise and achievement be demonstrated by the faculty member and, with limited exceptions, is conferred only upon faculty who have earned the terminal degree in their field (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).
- C. Exceptional performance or extraordinary conditions may warrant accelerated promotion (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).

- D. In an exceptional case the ARRT Committee may initiate a recommendation for promotion (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).
- E. A recommendation for promotion is based on positive evidence of professional performance and achievement. It is not justified by longevity or lack of negative indications. Therefore, promotion from one rank to another is not to be considered automatic (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).
- F. Petition for Review of Non-Promotion. Appeals from decisions not to promote are governed by "Appeals from ARRT Decisions", with the following restriction: Negative decisions regarding promotion will be reviewed on appeal only in exceptional cases, since the normal recourse is to reapply (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).

V. ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE

- A. Tenure is permanence of appointment until retirement. A grant of tenure affirms that the candidate has contributed to the University throughout his or her probationary period and is valued as a permanent member of the University community (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).
- B. Tenure must be granted after a probationary period of seven years of full-time service at the University. The faculty member shall be notified of the decision on tenure not later than the end of the sixth year of service (USD, 4.2.2, p.4).
- C. Up to three years of previous full-time service at another institution may be counted as part of the probationary period. The Dean will state the amount of service accepted as part of the probationary period in writing at the time of the initial appointment (USD, 4.2.2, p.5).
- D. Scholarly leave of absence without pay for one year or less will not count as part of the probationary period unless the individual and the institution agree in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted (USD, 4.2.2, p.5).
- E. In all cases there will be at least two full (non-expedited) ARRT Committee reappointment reviews before the tenure review (SOLES, 3/10/04).

VI. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE REVIEW TIMELINE

Under the biennial system, ARRT reviews of non-tenured faculty take place as follows:

- A. Candidates not awarded prior years of service at another Institution or institutions:

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Fall	Expedited	2 nd year reappointment
2	Fall	Full	3 rd & 4 th year reappointment
3	Fall	Expedited	5 th year reappointment
4	Spring	Full	6 th year reappointment
5	Fall	Expedited	7 th year reappointment Tenure/Promotion
6	Spring	Full	(Tenure begins at the start of the 8 th year of service)

Candidates in their first, third, and fifth years of service follow an expedited review process. Instead of a complete file, candidates submit to the Dean, by December 1, a list of recent and current activities in teaching, scholarship, service, and support of the mission. The Dean attaches the list to a ballot that is sent to all tenure track faculty members. The faculty members vote either to reappoint the candidate or to have a full ARRT Committee review. Full reviews are triggered when voted for by one-third or more of the eligible tenure track faculty (not counting the candidate) (SOLES 10/1/2003).

- B. Candidates awarded one year of service at another institution or institutions.

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Fall	Expedited	2 nd year reappointment
2	Fall	Full	3 rd & 4 th year reappointment
3	Spring	Full	5 th year reappointment
4	Fall	Expedited	6 th year reappointment
5	Spring	Full	Tenure/Promotion (Tenure begins at the start of

the 7th year of service)

C. Candidates awarded two years of service at another institution or institutions:

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Fall	Expedited	2 nd year reappointment
2	Fall	Full	3 rd & 4 th year reappointment
<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
3	Spring	Full	5 th year reappointment Tenure/Promotion
4	Spring	Full	(Tenure begins at the start of the 6 th year of service)

D. Candidates awarded three years of service at another institution or institutions:

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Spring	Full	2 nd year reappointment
2	Spring	Full	3 rd & 4 th year reappointment Tenure/Promotion
4	Spring	Full	(Tenure begins at the start of the 5 th year of service)

VII. PROCEDURES TO TRIGGER FULL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW IN PLACE OF EXPEDITED REVIEW (SOLES 3/10/04)

A. Full reviews for candidates in expedited review years can be initiated by any of the following methods:

1. The candidate, by written request to the Dean.
2. The ARRT Committee, through majority vote.
3. The Dean, by written request to the ARRT Committee.
4. Vote of one-third of the eligible tenure-track faculty in the SOLES (not counting the candidate).
5. Within one week of the tenured faculty vote, candidates will receive a letter from the ARRT chair informing them of the overall outcome of the

vote. At the request of the candidate, the ARRT chair will include the number of votes received for expedited and full review (SOLES 5/16/07).

VIII. EXTERNAL LETTERS OF REVIEW OF A CANDIDATE'S SCHOLARSHIP (SOLES, 5/29/03 and 5/16/07)

As part of the dossier for tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, a candidate must include written evaluations of scholarship from external reviewers. The sending of the formal external review letter and candidate documentation will be completed by October 1st. The external reviewers will be informed that the review letter must be received at least 2 weeks prior to the university date for submission of documentation for tenure and/or promotion. This date is usually in January.

- A. Criteria for selection of External Reviewers: In most cases external reviewers will be faculty in Institutions of Higher Education. All faculty recommended to serve as external reviewers of a candidate's scholarship must be above the current rank of the faculty candidate. (SOLES 12/7/2011)
- B. These letters are to be written by individuals that have the scholarly achievement and/or demonstrated expertise as scholarship is defined in the SOLES Statement on Scholarship.
- C. Identification of Potential External Reviewers: The candidate will produce a list of 7 potential outside reviewers. Information about each potential external reviewer must include reviewer name, rank or position, and institutional affiliation and any special titles. The candidate must also include a rationale for recommending this individual and what relationship, if any, the candidate has with the reviewer. The list of potential external reviewers (along with contact information) must be submitted to the Dean by August 1st of the review year. The Dean will provide the ARRT Committee Chair with the list of external reviewers to be contacted. The ARRT Committee will review the Dean's selections for approval at its first meeting in September. (SOLES 12/7/2011)
- D. Soliciting External Reviewers: The Dean will contact each potential external reviewer to ask if he or she would be willing to serve as a reviewer of the candidate's scholarship. The potential external reviewer will be informed of the expectations of the evaluation review that is included in a letter addressed to the ARRT committee.

E. Formal External Review Procedures: The Dean will provide each external reviewer with:

1. The candidate's Curriculum Vita.
2. A representative sample of the candidate's scholarship.
3. A standard letter requesting commentary about a candidate's scholarship.
4. A copy of the criteria for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and the SOLES statement on scholarship.

The representative sample of the candidate's scholarship will be supplied by the candidate. This will include a statement on their scholarship along with 3 to 4 samples of their scholarship. The candidate will provide the Dean's office with an electronic version of the Curriculum Vita, scholarship statement, and scholarship samples (excluding books) so that all of the materials can be sent electronically to the external reviewers. The Dean's office will supply a paper copy of the materials to the external reviewer upon request. (SOLES 12/7/2011, SOLES 4/4/2012).

Each reviewer will address his or her response to the chair of the ARRT committee. The sending of the formal external review letter and candidate documentation will be completed by October 1st. The external reviewers will be informed that the review letter must be received at least 2 weeks prior to the university date for submission of documentation for tenure and/or promotion. This date is usually in January.

F. Policies Related to External Letters of Review of Scholarship Solicited by the Dean:

1. Candidates for tenure and promotion shall have samples of their work reviewed by at least three scholars solicited by the Dean from other institutions in the candidate's field of expertise.
2. Letters should be addressed and sent to the ARRT Committee Chair. The ARRT Chair will provide the Dean with a copy of each letter.

3. Letters are confidential and available only to members of USD who are part of the ARRT process.
- G. Policies Related to Optional Letters of Review of Scholarship Solicited by Candidates: Candidates may solicit non-confidential reviews in addition to those solicited by the Dean. Candidate-solicited reviews will be kept separately from reviews solicited by the Dean and be identified specifically as candidate-solicited for the ARRT Committee.

IX. PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

A. General Procedures:

1. Prior to his or her appointment, each faculty member will have been given a copy of this Policy. Expectations and/or emphases not explicitly stated in this Policy (see Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion) will also have been brought to his or her attention in writing. These expectations and/or emphases should be brought to the attention of the Committee no later than the time the faculty member first becomes a candidate for review. Status with respect to rank and tenure is not altered by a faculty member's transfer between departments or schools within the university (USD, 4.2.2, p.1).
2. The process of evaluation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure is initiated and conducted by the relevant department or school [School of Leadership and Education Sciences] (USD, 4.2.2, p.1).
3. The Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the President in all matters concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty candidates (USD, 4.2.2, p.1).
4. The Dean will maintain a confidential archival file for all candidates evaluated by the ARRT Committee. After each review, copies of the ARRT Committee's letter to the President, the letter from the Dean to the ARRT Committee, confidential faculty letters to the ARRT Committee, confidential external review letters, and the ARRT Committee's letter to the candidate, will be placed in the candidate's ARRT file by the Dean. The Dean is responsible for bringing each candidate's archival file (if any) to the meeting at which he or she will be reviewed (SOLES. 3/10/04).

5. The President grants reappointment and promotion to faculty members. After notification to the Board of Trustees, the President grants tenure to faculty members (USD, 4.2.2, p.1).

B. Initial Steps

1. Each Dean and/or Department Chair is required to establish written procedures for the preparation of candidates' files, including recommendations and relevant supporting data (USD, 4.2.2, p.2). Candidates should follow the written policies in preparing their materials for submission (SOLES, 5/16/07).
2. At the beginning of the academic year, each [the] Dean [in cooperation with the ARRT Committee Chair] will prepare a list of names of faculty eligible for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure [in SOLES] (USD, 4.2.2, p.2), SOLES parenthetical insertions, 5/16/07). Once approved by the ARRT Committee, the list will be distributed to all tenure track faculty by the October faculty meeting for review and correction, if necessary (SOLES 5/16/07).
3. Any faculty member who wishes to be considered for early tenure or full professor will notify the dean in writing by May 31st of the academic year prior to the anticipated review (SOLES 2/3/10).
4. Faculty members shall be given timely notice of when decisions affecting their reappointment, promotion, or tenure will be made, so that they will have adequate opportunity to prepare their file (USD, 4.2.2, p.2). The ARRT Committee Chair will send a letter by the end of September to each candidate notifying them of their current status and file due dates (SOLES 5/16/07).
5. At a minimum, each candidate should provide a summary of course evaluations dating back to the previous promotion or date of hire (SOLES, 10/3/2000). The candidate should also include collegial evaluations of teaching that were conducted in the period since the last ARRT review. Collegial evaluation might take many forms, including peer observation of teaching, peer evaluation of course materials, evaluation of instructional contributions including the development of new courses and other program development activities, evaluation of student work artifacts, or other items (SOLES, 2/2/05).

6. At a minimum, each applicant should submit all publications since the date of his/her promotion or date of hire (SOLES, 10/3/00). [note: To abide by the tenure and promotion page limit, candidates may place publications in a separate binder. However, separate binders will not be forwarded to the President].
7. As part of the dossier for tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor a candidate must include written evaluations of scholarship from external reviewers. The sending of the formal external review letter and candidate documentation will be completed by October 1st. The external reviewers will be informed that the review letter must be received at least 2 weeks prior to the university date for submission of documentation for tenure and/or promotion. This date is usually in January (SOLES, 5/29/03).
8. Candidate files will not contain letters from current students, whether solicited or unsolicited (SOLES, 5/5/04).
9. Whatever materials a candidate has turned in by the stated deadline for candidate submission of promotion and tenure materials shall be the content made available to faculty for their consideration. No materials are to be added to faculty-review materials after the candidate's submission deadline. However, candidates may submit supplementary material to the Dean's office after the deadline, with the understanding that these materials will be kept in an ARRT Committee notebook that will be utilized only by the ARRT Committee (SOLES, 12/7/07).
10. Recommendations concerning a candidate from Department Chairs, Program Directors, and/or the Dean in their capacities as such must be submitted to the Committee prior to the conclusion of their deliberations. These recommendations, including any amendments or additions to them by the recommender, must be included as part of the evidence provided by the Committee to the President. These recommendations should include a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications; evidence in support of that assessment; and the recommender's report of his or her consultation with faculty members of the candidate's department or academic unit, including any dissenting opinions (USD, 4.2.2, p.2).

11. The Dean shall write a letter regarding the candidate's performance, and forward it to the chair of the ARRT committee at least one week prior to the ARRT meeting. The Dean will outline his or her evaluation of the candidate's performance in each of the four areas (teaching, scholarship, service, and support of mission/values of the University), and whether or not they support the candidate's request for reappointment, rank, or tenure (SOLES, 2/28/01).

C. Candidate Review Process

1. One week before candidates' files are due, the chair of the ARRT Committee will invite tenure track faculty in SOLES to submit evaluative letters for its review. The notice will include the date that the files will be available for viewing and the last day on which faculty letters may be submitted. The deadline for receipt of letters shall be at least one week before the meeting of the ARRT Committee. The faculty should be allowed a minimum of two weeks for reviewing the file and submitting letters. Letters should focus on the four ARRT criteria. The letters are confidential and for the ARRT Committee only. Information from the confidential letters, but not the letters themselves, can be included in the ARRT letter to the candidate. If information from confidential letters is included in the letter to the candidate, it must be done in such a way as to protect the identity of the writer. Confidential letters are not normally forwarded in the candidate's dossier to the President unless the President requests it. However, pertinent information may be shared, without identifying attributes, in the letter to the President. The letters are maintained in the Dean's office in a confidential file until two years after the candidate terminates her or his employment at USD (SOLES, 5/5/04, SOLES 12/7/2011).
2. Letters of Support Attesting to a Candidate's Areas of Contribution: In situations where a candidate has made a contribution in areas such as public policy, school governance, professional organization leadership, etc., he or she can solicit non-confidential letters from references that describe these contributions. All such letters should be addressed to the chair of the ARRT committee (SOLES 5/29/03, revised 5/16/07).
3. At least five members of the ARRT Committee must be present to constitute a quorum at the meeting (SOLES, 3/10/04).

4. ARRT members will review the candidate's materials and the Dean's letter prior to the ARRT meeting. The ARRT members will also review the University ARRT Guidelines and the SOLES ARRT Guidelines prior to attending the ARRT meeting (SOLES, 2/28/01).
5. The chair of the ARRT committee will run the ARRT meetings (SOLES, 2/28/01).
6. ARRT committee members will discuss the candidate's qualifications in the four areas. Discussion of the candidates will be confidential, and no part of the discussion will be shared with anyone outside of the ARRT meeting (SOLES, 2/28/01).
7. After the discussion of the candidate, ARRT members will vote on whether they will approve, disapprove, or abstain regarding the request by the candidate for reappointment, rank, or tenure. If the candidate is going forward for both rank and tenure, separate votes will be recorded for rank and tenure decisions (SOLES, 2/28/01).
8. Favorable recommendations require a two-thirds positive vote of Committee members present at the meeting when the vote is taken with the additional requirement that the favorable votes constitute at least a simple majority of the possible votes of the total Committee membership. A minimum of 4 votes is required to communicate a decision (SOLES, 3/10/04).
9. The ARRT committee will write a report to the President indicating whether or not they support the candidate's request for reappointment, rank, or tenure, and their reasons for their position. The memo will include the vote(s) for reappointment, rank, or tenure. The Dean's letter will be forwarded with the ARRT report to the President (SOLES, 2/28/01).
10. In addition to an overall vote for reappointment, rank, and tenure, ARRT members will be asked to vote on the level of performance of the candidate in each of the four areas (teaching, scholarship, service, and support of mission/values of the University). ARRT members will be asked to vote if the candidate's performance: 1) Exceeds expectations, 2) meets expectations, or 3) is below expectations. ARRT members may also abstain if they feel they cannot properly evaluate a candidate's

performance in a particular area. A vote of “exceeds expectations” means the ARRT member believes the candidate’s performance is especially meritorious and should get special recognition. A vote of “meets expectations” means the candidate’s performance is solid. A vote of “below expectations” means the ARRT member has significant concerns about the candidate’s level of performance, and that special attention should be paid in developing this area on the part of the candidate. Judgments as to whether or not the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations should take into consideration the candidate’s level of experience (SOLES, 2/28/01).

11. The ARRT Committee will continue to send the below, meets, exceeds ratings to the candidates, but the ratings will not be reported to the President (SOLES, 3/10/04).
12. After notification of the President’s decision, the Committee will send the candidate a copy of its recommendation and accompanying rationale (or summary of report) made to the President (USD 2.4.2 , p. 3). The letter from the ARRT committee will include the following: 1) the frequency distribution of votes in each of the four areas; 2) whether or not the ARRT committee approved the request for reappointment, rank, or tenure; and 3) any written comments or feedback the ARRT committee believes are important for the candidate to know such as areas of strength or areas that need attention or development (SOLES, 2/28/01).
13. The Dean will provide the candidate a copy of his or her letter sent to the ARRT committee, or provide feedback to the candidate in some other form acceptable to the Dean and candidate (SOLES, 2/28/01).

X. ADVERSE RANK AND TENURE DECISION

- A. The appropriate administrative officer will give the candidate a written explanation of the reasons for denial of reappointment, promotion, or tenure (USD, 4.2.2, p.3).
- B. A candidate may appeal the President's decision not to recommend reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Appeals are governed by "Appeals from ARRT Decisions" in section 4.6. (USD, 4.2.2, p.3).

XI. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR REAPPOINTMENT DECISIONS

- A. Reappointments may be for one year or other stated periods, subject to renewal. When the Committee has identified special concerns that may jeopardize future reappointment, the candidate should be informed in writing of those concerns at the time of reappointment (USD, 4.2.2, p.3).

- B. Standards for Notice. Because a probationary appointment carries an expectation of renewal, notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment, will be given in writing according to the following (USD, 4.2.2, p.3):
 - 1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.

 - 2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.

 - 3. At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years at the University.

XII. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

The following criteria apply to the evaluation of faculty candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. They are meant to govern the evaluative processes of rank and tenure committees, and to give faculty candidates an understanding of University expectations with respect to these processes.

In the context of the employment decision for which they are being considered, candidates shall be judged on the basis of their performance in 1) teaching; 2) research, creative work and professional activity; 3) university and public service; and 4) support of the University of San Diego.

In evaluating a candidate's qualifications within these four areas, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised by balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter responsibilities and commitments in another. Numerous sources of information should be used in

the evaluation of the candidate. Special emphasis should be given to peer evaluations.

Superior attainment, as evidenced primarily in teaching but not excluding research or other creative achievements, is an indispensable qualification for reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure.

The criteria set forth below are not intended to set boundaries to the elements of performance that may be considered, but rather to serve as guides in judging the candidate (USD, 4.2.3, p.5).

A. Teaching

1. Effective teaching is an essential criterion of reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure. Evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching shall be based upon the candidate's total performance. This evaluation should include considerations such as command of the subject; continuous growth in the field; ability to organize and present materials; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; a spirit of enthusiasm which vitalizes teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students; fairness in grading, through both subjective and objective considerations; participation in the guidance and advising of students (USD, 4.2.3, p.5).
2. Consideration shall be given to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels (USD, 4.2.3, p.6).
3. The Committee will clearly indicate the evidence upon which the appraisal of teaching effectiveness has been based. The following evidence of teaching effectiveness is required (USD, 4.2.3, p.6):
 - a. colleague evaluation
 - b. student evaluation
 - c. self-evaluation

Other types of evidence may also be submitted as supporting teaching effectiveness. Examples of these types of evidence are the following (USD, 4.2.3, p.5):

- d. participation as a guest or public lecturer
 - e. participation in team teaching
 - f. development of new and effective means of instruction
 - g. development of course materials
4. Statement on Teaching for the School of Education and Leadership Sciences (SOLES, 5/13/14)

Except in the instance of cardinal numbering (1,2,3) priority is not implied or assigned and no ordering of importance is intended.

- a. Values Statement Regarding Teaching: Candidates for promotion and tenure should be able to clearly articulate the philosophy and goals of their teaching as they relate to their specific field. Teaching is a dynamic endeavor that involves creativity, experimentation, leadership, personal reflection and collaboration. Candidates should specifically address teaching challenges and strategies for improvement. Further, candidates should provide evidence of how their teaching works synergistically with the other criteria for promotion and tenure at USD (scholarship, service, support for the mission and values).
- b. Definition: Teaching can take on many forms. Quality teaching is responsive to students' needs, facilitates critical thinking, respectfully challenges students, models continuous learning, values multicultural perspectives, strives toward specific learning outcomes, and engages students in the learning process in an inclusive way. The ARRT committee recognizes that quality teaching is multidimensional and complex. As such we have created a working definition in an attempt to encourage candidates to reflect and report on high quality teaching across many professional contexts.
 - Academic Advising- Mentoring and advising students beyond course selection and matriculation is a valuable area of teaching. Developments and improvements to advising can have a huge impact upon student learning.
 - Classroom Instruction- Developing new teaching strategies, incorporating new technologies, designing new assessment strategies, engaging students in innovative experiential learning experiences, locating new course materials and designing appropriate assignments help to enhance classroom instruction and maintain high expectations of quality classroom teaching.

Classroom instruction may also take place beyond the SOLES classroom involving students in global learning experiences.

- Clinical Instruction and Supervision- Many professional training programs involve some form of clinical or supervisory instruction. The goals and learning objectives of these educational experiences can be very different from classroom teaching. Advancing supervision strategies, improving assessment practices and/or designing innovative clinical experiences are important teaching endeavors.
 - Curriculum Development- Programs and faculty consistently work to respond to new developments and/or changes in requirements (i.e., state licensing boards, credentialing requirements, accrediting bodies, etc.). Designing and redesigning courses, course sequences and program requirements are important teaching elements that can play a major role in student training and their ability to access professional opportunities.
 - Domestic Diversity Learning – Across advising, classroom instruction, clinical instruction and supervision, and curriculum development activities, faculty are creating intentional learning environments for students to understand the historical, social and political forces that have contributed to and maintained social and educational inequities, have adversely affected people’s mental health and well-being, and are disproportionately represented in U.S. racial/ethnic minorities and immigrant communities. These efforts aim to increase students’ levels of self-awareness, knowledge, and skills in working with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds. In this context, diversity is defined broadly and include, but are not limited to: addressing nationalism, culture, class, race/ethnicity, ability/disability, religion/spirituality, gender, and sexual orientation.
- c. Criteria for Assessment: It is helpful to distinguish between the criteria for evaluating teaching from the actual methods that we use to evaluate teaching. No single criterion is adequate to measure teaching, and some criteria may not apply in all cases. These criteria, to some extent, may overlap and include:
- Does the teaching demonstrate command of the subject?
 - Is the teaching innovative? Is technology or any other innovative tool/approach used in a pedagogically meaningful and effective way?

- Are teaching materials organized and presented to students effectively?
 - Does the teaching help students become intrinsically motivated to learn and pursue the subject and the contents?
 - Are strategies in place to measure student performance?
 - Does teaching involve strategies for constructive feedback?
 - Are student academic and dispositional challenges addressed constructively?
 - Does teaching promote experiential and/or transformational learning opportunities?
 - Does teaching demonstrate involve attempts to construct beneficial learning environments?
 - Does the instructor provide information that is useful or valuable to know?
- a. Methods of Assessment: The above criteria are difficult to measure. Efforts to assess teaching can parallel the challenges that researchers face trying to define and operationalize constructs. No instrument is a perfect measure of the construct. These indicators, particularly in isolation, are not infallible. The candidates under review should use the items listed below as resources for developing a case that they have met expectations in the area of teaching:
- Colleague evaluation - A colleague evaluation offers a candidate feedback that pinpoints their strengths and areas for improvement exposed in other forms of assessment. Colleague evaluations should be conducted at the request of the faculty member wishing to be reviewed, and may be a required evaluative tool at the department/program level. The ARRT committee encourages candidates to include more than one colleague evaluation. When selecting a colleague reviewer the candidate should consider the nature of the collegial relationship and the potential for the colleague reviewer to be objective and/or constructive in their assessment. Colleague evaluation can take many forms, but should involve a structure established within a collegial relationship. The colleague reviewer should offer feedback that: 1) considers whether the courses of the faculty member have appropriate

content and offer students sufficient opportunity to acquire desired professional knowledge and/or skills; 2) considers whether the grading system and evaluation/assessment tools are consistent with course content and student skill development; 3) examines the teaching methods of the faculty member for effectiveness; and 4) recognizes the risks and successes inherent in creative teaching methods. Potentially, the colleague reviewer should facilitate feedback before, during, and after teaching sessions. Feedback should be based on: 1) examination of materials for the course (e.g., syllabus, handouts, tests, web pages, etc.); and 2) classroom observation(s) in the classroom or clinical instructional settings and/or 3) data gathered from ongoing teaching mentoring. After the colleague evaluation, the peer reviewer should produce a report that is discussed with the candidate being reviewed and presents the strengths and areas for improvement for the teaching of the faculty member.

- Student Evaluations- Student review of teaching is required in SOLES via an on-line evaluation system. Sixteen items are scored on a seven-point scale and three open-ended student questions reflect more qualitative or attitudinal factors. While student reviews occur each semester, they should not receive a superior rating over other forms of assessment during the review process. Candidates under review should respond to student ratings and explain important contextual information that may aid ARRT committee members in analyzing student assessment data. Candidates may include other forms of informal student-elicited assessment data if available. Though candidates are encouraged to include the conditions and purposes for which the data was collected (e.g., conducting research on teaching, peer facilitated mid-semester evaluation, etc.).
- Self-Evaluation – It is important for candidates to reflectively assess their own teaching. For example, a self-assessment document may include, but not be limited to, teaching goals, methods for achieving these goals, and plans for achieving teaching excellence. The document may be supported by a collection teaching examples/documentation that demonstrates implementations or successes of their teaching philosophy, improved teaching skills, consideration of alternative teaching objectives and methods, or other aspects of their teaching that warrants discussion.

- Supplementary Forms of Teaching Evidence- Additional supplementary evidence may, but is not required to, include the following:
 - Teaching awards. Awards for teaching, nominations for awards, or grants related to instructional innovations should be included.
 - Evidence of teaching excellence through publications. For example, individuals may publish articles on how they teach a course or the development of a new course for the field. Likewise, developing a widely used text for a training program could be additional evidence for teaching excellence.
 - Feedback on courses by alumni. Former students who are now in the work force may be able to give a different perspective on the quality of the materials or concepts taught in course. Were there important deficits? Or, do they feel the course prepared them for the real world in that particular area?
 - Employers/Supervisors – Do employers or supervisors of our current students (schools, agencies) believe they have the necessary skills to be successful? Likewise, do employers or supervisors of our students after graduation feel our graduates have the necessary skills, or do they perceive deficits in a particular area?
 - Curricular materials. Faculty may include course or clinical instructional materials that they have developed including syllabi, curricula, global learning materials, online materials, and/or handbooks that have contributed to supporting students' learning.
 - Performance on program, state, or national exams – The ability to pass sections of a comprehensive exam might point to the strength or deficiencies in a particular class.
 - Evidence of Teaching Development- Candidates under review may take advantage of any external (campus or off-campus) resource designed to address issues related to teaching. These resources may be used for a range of instructional needs that could include syllabus consultation, videotape feedback or direct observation in order to provide faculty with confidential, independent feedback about teaching through a variety of formats. Candidates may want to include evidence of

professional development activities that specifically speak to challenging areas noted within the other forms of teaching assessment (self-evaluation, colleague evaluation, student-evaluation).

B. Research, Creative Work and Professional Activity

1. In evaluating the candidate's publications or recognized artistic productions, the Committee should seek evidence of a productive and creative mind; and the candidate's professional activities should be examined for evidence of achievement and/or leadership in the field. Evidence of research, creative work, or professional activity is not limited to publications or presentations at meetings of professional associations. Contributions by the candidate in the form of publications and presentations for the advancement of scientific or other critical inquiry, professional practice, or education shall be judged research, creative work, and professional activity when (1) they develop new ideas, add to the knowledge of an academic discipline, or incorporate scholarly research, and (2) they are disseminated in academic or professional communities.
2. Publications and other creative accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible.
3. When jointly authored work is presented as evidence, the Department Chair or Dean must establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in that joint effort. It should be recognized that special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts and that the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. When the candidate is such a collaborator, the Department Chair and Dean should evaluate the candidate's contribution and should provide outside opinions based on observations of the work while in progress (USD, 4.2.3, p. 6).
4. Statement on Scholarship for the School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES, 5/04/05)
 - a. Values Statement Regarding Scholarship: Although pursuing scholarship may provide benefits to the individual (e.g., satisfy

intellectual curiosity, help in achieving rank and tenure), we recognize that scholarship's primary value lies in its ability to advance the public good and one's profession. Therefore, candidates for promotion and tenure should be able to clearly articulate the foci and goals of their programs of scholarship as they relate to advancing the public good in the specific areas outlined below (knowledge base, teaching, practice, and policy). Further, we recognize that scholarship does not occur in a vacuum, and candidates should consider how their programs of scholarship work synergistically with the other criteria for promotion and tenure at USD (teaching, service, support for the mission and values).

b. Definition:

Scholarship is the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. Scholarship must reflect new knowledge, rather than a simple restatement of preexisting knowledge. New knowledge, however, can be created through synthesizing or integrating pre-existing knowledge in new or innovative ways. Scholarship should advance the knowledge base, teaching, practice, or policy within a profession or the public domain. Peer review is also an essential part of scholarship. Through peer review, others who are knowledgeable can help us (and the field) assess the extent to which a piece of work adds to the body of knowledge and is of potential value to the field.

- Advancing the knowledge base – Scholarship that advances the knowledge base could take multiple forms including: empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, synthesizing knowledge through literature reviews, or philosophical inquiry and analysis. Applying or integrating concepts and research from other disciplines can be another means of advancing the knowledge base of the profession.
- Advancing Teaching – Scholarship can advance the way in which knowledge is taught or learned. Scholarship in this area would include: developing new or improved textbooks, developing new or innovative approaches to teaching, assessment of new or current teaching practices, or studying the processes by which information is learned.

- Advancing Practice – Scholarship can advance the practice of a profession. Scholarship in this area can include: developing practice implications from research, developing new or innovative approaches to practice, developing new or improved methods of assessment, revising or developing new theories for practice, evaluating current or new practices, or advancing the ethical standards of practice within the profession.
- Advancing Policy – Scholarship can also advance policy within a discipline or the public domain. Scholarship in this area may include: critiquing an existing policy, evaluating the effectiveness of a current policy, or developing policy implications from research, theory, or historical analysis.

To qualify as scholarship, there must also be dissemination of the knowledge to the public and/or individual's profession.

Dissemination could potentially take different forms, including:

- (a) Journal articles or monographs
- (b) Books
- (c) Presentations
- (d) Assessment instruments
- (e) Internet or websites (e.g., electronic journals, etc.)
- (f) Policy papers
- (g) Final public grant reports

c. Criteria for Assessment:

It can be helpful to distinguish between the criteria for evaluating scholarship from the actual methods that we use to evaluate scholarship. No single criterion is adequate to measure scholarship, and some criteria may not apply in all cases. These criteria, to some extent, may overlap with one another. They include:

- Is the information new or innovative? In other words, does it add to the field's body of knowledge? A literature review in an article, for example, should make the case that the article offers something new (and of potential value) to the body of knowledge.

- What is the quality of the process through which the new information was derived? For an empirical study, this would likely be the methodological rigor of the study. For a non-empirical piece, does the author use other compelling logic or evidence to support his or her argument? The quality of the work is important because it can impact the credibility of the author's conclusions.
- What was the quality of the review process? Did an informed and critical audience evaluate the work prior to the work being disseminated?
- Does the new knowledge have potential value to others? In other words, what will be the impact of the work? Although this can be very difficult to predict in most cases, it is still a worthwhile question to ask regarding our scholarship. Will others benefit from this new bit of knowledge, or is it simply a trivial fact with little relevance?
- How broadly will the information be disseminated? As a general rule, the broader the dissemination, the greater the potential the resulting work will have an impact. It may be possible to argue in some cases, however, that dissemination of a work to a smaller but influential target audience can produce greater impact.

d. Method of Assessment:

The above criteria are difficult to measure. Efforts to assess scholarship can parallel the challenges that researchers face trying to define and operationalize constructs. No instrument is a perfect measure of the construct. These indicators, particularly in isolation, are not infallible. The faculty members under review should use the items listed below as a guideline for developing a case that they have met expectations in the area of scholarship.

- Peer Review – It is important to assess whether or not a piece of work was peer reviewed, and the quality of that review process. Assessing the quality of review may mean looking at several questions. How many individuals reviewed the work? Was the work reviewed on a local, regional, national, or international level?

To what extent is there evidence that the reviewers are recognized for their knowledge in the area? What is the acceptance rate of the journal or conference (where applicable)?

- Selectivity of Publisher or Journal – The selectivity of a publisher or journal can be an indicator of quality. Since more prestigious journals generally receive a higher volume of submissions, they can usually be more selective in what they publish. Thus, the acceptance rate of a journal or publisher can be an indicator of the quality of scholarship.
 - Evidence of Impact through Breadth of Dissemination – In general, scholarship that reaches a broader audience has the potential to make a greater impact. The greater the exposure, the more opportunity there will be for individuals to use or apply the ideas from the scholarship to make an impact. Breadth of dissemination could be measured in different ways. The number of books sold or the circulation of a journal could be used to measure breadth of dissemination for books and journals. Other measures may be appropriate for less traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., number of hits for a website that qualifies as scholarship).
 - Number of Citations – Another potential measure of impact may be the number of times a work is cited by others. Since few pieces of work are widely cited, this may be a rather high standard to hold. Yet, those pieces of work that are widely cited can be clearly recognized as having an impact.
 - Other Measures of Impact – In some cases, other means of measuring impact may be appropriate beyond those stated above. It may be possible, for example, for an individual to document how his or her scholarship has influenced teaching or practice within a discipline. Or, an individual might be able to document how his or her scholarship has influenced legislation or policy.
- e. Scholarship's Relationship to the Other Criteria
- Relationship to Teaching – The Teacher-Scholar model implies that scholarship is both distinct and an integral part of teaching.

To best prepare our students for their professions, we need to educate them on the most recent knowledge in the field. Being active scholars helps us infuse the most recent knowledge and practices into our teaching. Insights gained from teaching, similarly, can become the impetus for scholarship, particularly in advancing the scholarship of teaching.

- Relationship to Service – Although scholarship is a criterion for achieving rank and tenure, we believe its primary value is in its ability to advance one’s profession or the public good. If scholarship is pursued in this spirit, then scholarship can be viewed as a means of providing service to others.
- Relationship to Mission & Values – We recognize that scholarship is a value-based endeavor. We believe that the Mission and Values of the University of San Diego should inform our scholarship. Our scholarship should also be informed by the ethical and professional standards within our particular fields. We will also strive to respect the dignity and rights of those involved in our scholarship (e.g., research participants, students, co- authors, or others)

C. University and Public Service:

The faculty plays an important role in formulating and administering the policies of the University. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, school or college, and university policies. Services by members of the faculty to the University, community, state, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities, should likewise be recognized.

Similarly, the following should be given recognition: contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisor to student organizations; extraordinary recruiting or fundraising activity; special lectures; public relations activities; other services to the university community, such as arranging cultural, social, and educational events for faculty and students (USD, 4.2.3, p.7).

D. Support of the University of San Diego:

Faculty members support the spiritual and moral orientation of the University of San Diego through their respect for Catholic Christianity and their recognition that the spiritual and moral aspects of the students' lives are significant. They have a sense of responsibility and concern towards the entire University community (USD, 4.2.3, p.7).

XIII. TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT (USD, 4.2.4, p.7)

A. Termination by a Faculty Member:

Faculty members may terminate their appointments effective at the end of an academic year, provided that they give notice in writing of their intention to resign or of negotiations that may lead to their resignation. Notice should be given at the earliest possible opportunity, in no event by the later of (1) May 15 or (2) thirty days after receiving notification of the terms of the appointment for the coming year. The University will attempt to accommodate requests for waiver of the notice requirement in cases of hardship or of substantial professional advancement or other opportunity; its faculty members, however, should abide by the University's decision.

B. Termination by the Institution:

The University may terminate a faculty member for reasons of retrenchment, medical or disability reasons, or serious cause.

1. Retrenchment. The University may terminate a faculty member because of retrenchment: a reduction of faculty due to financial exigency or to discontinuance of a department or program for reasons of non-financial exigency. Retrenchment terminations (including appeal procedures) are covered in detail in the other university policies.
2. Medical or Disability Reasons. Consistent with applicable laws, the University may terminate a faculty member because of a medical or disability condition that substantially precludes the faculty member from fulfilling the terms of his or her appointment. Termination of an appointment with tenure, or of a probationary or special appointment before the end of the period of appointment, for medical or disability

reasons will be based on clear and convincing evidence that the faculty member cannot continue to fulfill the terms and conditions of his or her appointment in whole or in significant part. The University's decision to terminate will be reached only after:

- a. Any medical leave has been exhausted; and
- b. The University and faculty member have made efforts, appropriate to the faculty member's medical problem or disability, to explore alternatives to termination (such as retirement, transfer from full-time to part-time teaching, etc.) and to accommodate the faculty member's medical problem or disability.

The faculty member, or the representative or conservator of the faculty member, must be informed of the basis of the proposed termination and must be afforded the opportunity to present the faculty member's position and to respond to the evidence on which the University bases the proposed termination.

If the faculty member so requests, the decision to terminate for medical reasons may be appealed in accordance with the procedures established for appeals of other matters in this Policy. (See Section II.D in USD policy)

3. **Serious Cause.** The University may dismiss a faculty member for violation of professional ethics as described in the 1987 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics [addendum 1 to this Policy]. Examples of such violations include gross professional incompetence, continued neglect of academic duties or responsibilities, exploitation of students for private advantage, dishonesty in scholarship, and conviction of a felony.

Dismissal for serious cause (including appeal procedures) is covered in detail in this document. Dismissal for serious cause will not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of academic freedom.

4. **Severance Pay or Termination Notice**
 - a. If the appointment is terminated, the faculty member will receive severance pay or termination notice in accordance with the following schedule:

- (1) At least three months if the final decision is reached by March 1 (or three months prior to the expiration) of the first year of probationary service;
- (2) At least six months if the decision is reached by December 15 of the second year (or after nine months but prior to the expiration of eighteen months) of probationary service;
- (3) At least one year if the decision is reached after eighteen months of probationary service or after the faculty member has tenure.

This provision for severance pay or termination notice need not apply in the event that there has been a finding that the conduct which justified dismissal involved moral turpitude as described in paragraph 3 of Section 9, 1970 Interpretive Comments on the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

- b. In accordance with the appeals procedure (see Section II.D) and/or on the recommendation of the President, the Board of Trustees may take into account the length and quality of service of the faculty member in determining what, if any, payments will be made beyond the effective date of dismissal.

File Preparation Recommendations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

The following is not SOLES policy but has been used as a guide for candidates putting together files for reappointment promotion and tenure. (Last Revised November 2, 2011)

General advice or recommendations:

- It is recommended that you read the files of other faculty members, particularly if you have not prepared a file before. This will enable you to see how others have presented their materials and help you determine which approach will work best for you in presenting your case.
- Before submitting your file, you may want to consider having other faculty members review your file and give you feedback. Since faculty members may have different

perspectives on how to best prepare a file, you may want to obtain feedback from multiple faculty members.

- When preparing the file, you should include all the categories in the table of contents unless it is clearly stated as being optional. When the guide poses questions that the candidate may want to consider, you are not required to answer them. They are simply posed to help guide you on how you might want to respond.
- The overall length of the blue file should generally not exceed more than 75 pages by a significant amount. The length of the file could be shorter, particularly if you are filing for an early reappointment. You should strive to be as concise as possible in summarizing and presenting your file, yet provide sufficient evidence to support your case. You always have the option of including additional materials in a supplemental binder, which might include your publications, teaching evaluations (e.g., student narratives), or other materials. However, these materials should supplement what is presented in the main file, and should not be a substitute for evidence that should be contained in the main file.
- Although it is important that candidates document their strengths and accomplishments, a thoughtful and credible analysis of one's performance may need to include a discussion of challenges or difficulties. When discussing challenges or difficulties, provide a thoughtful analysis as to why they exist and discuss how they will be addressed in the future.
- When preparing your ARRT file, we recommend that you consider the ultimate purpose and spirit in which you are preparing the document. Although the file is important in documenting your accomplishments to others, it is also an opportunity to reflect upon your own work. As you prepare your file, you may want to consider the following questions and how they might frame how you prepare your document:
 - What is your own orientation toward your work today as a faculty member in SOLES? Has this orientation shifted over time or been influenced in particular ways that seem relevant for the reader to learn about or understand?
 - In reflecting on yourself and your work in the preparation of this review (as a scholar, colleague, and teacher), what has become clear to you professionally and/or personally?
 - What tone would you like to set for the reader in evaluating the materials you have included? How can you go about setting that tone?
 - How might you frame this document to represent more than a mere cataloguing of efforts as limitations and achievements, successes and difficulties - to see it as in fact a documentation of your journey that encompasses something of your own humanity and your connection to the work you have done?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General

1. Opening Statement (Optional)

- If desired, write an initial statement of whatever length seems appropriate to frame your ARRT file and orient your reader to your work. The opening statement, for example, may answer in an explicit way one or more of the questions posed in the preamble of the guide. The opening statement is not required, but can be added at the faculty member's discretion.

2. Curriculum Vitae

- Include current CV. When listing publications, separate refereed, non-refereed, manuscripts published, manuscripts in press, and manuscripts in progress. Use of APA style is recommended.

Evaluation and Recommendation

3. Dean's Current Summary and Evaluation

- Inserted by the Dean's office after candidate's submission of file. The Dean's letter is inserted after the faculty have reviewed the file, but prior to ARRT deliberations. (The candidate will receive a copy of the Dean's letter.)

4. Department Chair's Current Summary and Evaluation

- Letters from the Department Chair are inserted by the Dean's office after candidate's submission of the file. The Department Chair letter is inserted after the faculty have reviewed the file, but prior to ARRT deliberations. (The candidate will receive a copy of the letter.) Program directors can either write a confidential faculty letter (section 5) or a non-confidential letter (section 6).

5. ARRT Committee's Current Summary and Evaluation

- Inserted by the Dean's office after the ARRT review prior to forwarding the file to the President's office. (Removed when file returned to candidate)

6. Confidential Evaluations by SOLES faculty

- Inserted by the Dean's office after the faculty have reviewed the file, but prior to ARRT deliberations. (Removed when file returned to candidate)

7. Non-Confidential Evaluations from Colleagues and Others

- Inserted by the candidate before submission of file. Evaluations by current students are not permitted. Letters that speak specifically to the candidate being a good

colleague may better fit under Criterion IV, item 25. (These letters remain in the file when returned to the candidate.)

8. Confidential Evaluations from External Reviewers (Tenure & Promotion only)

- Refer to policy on External Reviews
- Inserted by the Dean's office after candidate's submission of file. (Removed when file returned to candidate)

9. Previous ARRT Reviews

- Inserted by the Dean's Office after file submission. The ARRT reviews are inserted after the faculty have reviewed the file, but prior to ARRT deliberations.

First Criterion: Teaching *(Revised by ARRT Committee 2/11/14)*

10. Statement on Teaching Accomplishments, Goals, Strengths, Weaknesses, and Notable Accomplishments.

- Develop and present a cogent, reflective discussion of your approach to teaching. Candidates are encouraged to consider the following questions in your statement:
 1. What are your major goals for teaching at USD?
 2. What principles and beliefs guide your approach to teaching?
 3. What new or redesigned courses or clinical supervision experiences have you developed at USD? How have these courses or supervision experiences contributed to SOLES programs? Syllabi or curricular materials may be attached as appendices.
 4. What innovative approaches to instruction have you implemented (the use of technology, experiential learning, team teaching, projects)?
 5. How do you measure student performance and provide feedback to promote continued learning?
 6. How do you organize your classes, clinical supervision, and/or advising to promote transformational learning and/or increase students' levels of self-awareness, knowledge and skills in working with individuals from diverse communities?
 7. What are your greatest successes as a teacher at USD?
 8. What challenges have you faced, and what might you change in future semesters?
 9. If concerns about teaching have been raised in previous ARRT reviews, this may be an appropriate place to demonstrate how they have been addressed or resolved.
 10. What professional development activities related to teaching have you been involved in and/or plan to get involved with?
- Student comments from evaluations may be woven into the narrative to support your points.

- Describe teaching goals for the next two years (e.g. new course development, new course teaching, team teaching, interdisciplinary, global teaching, use of technology, use of experiential pedagogies)

11. Record of Courses Taught by Semester

- Include a table with the following information organized by semester: Name of course, units/course, and the number of students per course. Be sure to include clinical supervision and global study courses. A sample template is included below:

Fall 2014

MFTS 500	Research Methods in Family Therapy (3)	18 students
MFTS 524	Family Theories II (3)	15 students
MFTS 546	Couples & Sex Therapy (3)	12 students

12. Summary of Student Course Evaluations

- If desired, write a narrative reflection on your course evaluations that expands upon your comments above in the item #10: Statement on Teaching Accomplishments, Goals, Strengths, Weaknesses, and Notable Accomplishments.
- Include a table that summarizes your quantitative evaluations since you arrived at USD (see attached sample in Appendix I). Arrange the scores either by semester or by successive semesters of the same course, depending on your point – improvement over time in the same course or changes in the course in future semesters in response to feedback.
- Include all quantitative evaluation sheets
- Include all student comment narrative evaluations

NOTE: You might put some information in a separate binder.

Make references in your text to where the reader will find information, if in a separate binder. If you include all of your student comment narrative evaluations in a separate binder, you may want to consider putting one or more examples in the main document.

13. Collegial Evaluation of Teaching

- According to SOLES policy on Collegial Evaluation of Teaching, “The candidate should also include collegial evaluations of teaching that were conducted in the period since the last ARRT review. Collegial evaluation might take many forms, including peer observation of teaching, peer evaluation of course materials, evaluation of instructional contributions including development of new courses and other program development activities, evaluation of student work artifacts, or other items”

14. Supervisory Work on Action Research Projects, Masters or Doctoral Theses

- Include a brief statement about your role as an advisor or committee member on student action research projects, masters or doctoral theses if it is not addressed in the narrative for the statement above (10).
- List the projects or theses you have participated in, including the following information: 1) Student name, 2) project title, 3) type of project (e.g., masters thesis, doctoral thesis), 4) role as advisor (e.g. chair, methodologist), and 5) date of completion.

15. Other Evidence of Excellence in Teaching

Additional evidence of excellence in teaching may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Include awards, nominations for awards, grants related to instructional innovations, other
- Evidence of teaching excellence through publications including academic journal articles on teaching practices or authored textbooks used for course instruction.
- Feedback on courses from alumni who can speak to the quality of the preparation they received.
- Evaluations by employees or field supervisors of our current students that specifically respond to the preparation they are receiving through your teaching.
- Portfolio advising and reading, preparing and assessing comprehensive exams, doctoral exams, mid-point interview and teaching events in the credential, others.
- Include evidence of excellence in teaching from other universities.

16. Evidence of Contribution to Student Advising

- Include a brief statement about your contribution as an academic advisor if it is not addressed in the narrative for point 9.
- Provide number and type of student advisees.
- Include description of independent studies.
- Describe committee work related to advisement forms and/or guidelines

Second Criterion: Scholarship

When describing your achievements in the area of scholarship, please refer to the USD and SOLES tenure and promotion policies, specifically the SOLES definition of scholarship, which can be found in the SOLES Faculty Handbook.

17. Statement on Current Status and Future Development of Scholarship

- Describe your past, present and future work, including your major areas of research, writing, and conference presentations. Demonstrate a coherent trajectory of your work, showing the growth and development of your ideas.

You may want to consider the following questions in your statement:

- a. What theories and bodies of research inform your scholarship?
- b. What are your major goals for your scholarship?
- c. What are the themes of your work? What are the major goals and outcomes of each theme?
- d. What projects are you currently pursuing?
- e. What has been your role on collaborative projects?
- f. What are the linkages between your scholarship, teaching, service and mission?
- g. If concerns of scholarship have been raised in previous ARRT reviews, this may be an appropriate place to demonstrate how they have been addressed or resolved.
- h. What direction will your work take in the future? Why?

- Provide examples of publications and conference presentations

18. Statement on Quality of Scholarship and Selectivity of Journals

- Provide a statement that addresses the quality of your scholarship. You want to point to a number of different indicators to build your argument.

You might want to consider the following questions in your statement:

- a. How many of your journal articles or other forms of scholarship are refereed?
- b. How selective are the journals in which you have published (e.g., acceptance rates)?
- c. What is the reputation or prestige of the journal or book press? For journals, you can discuss the impact index.
- d. How often has your work been cited by others?
- e. For books, how well have they sold? For textbooks, to what extent have they been adopted?
- f. What other measures might be used to demonstrate your scholarship is of high-quality or has had a significant impact (e.g., number of downloads for electronic articles, peer review of your scholarship)?

19. External Funding and Its Contribution to Scholarship

- Discuss grants you have received and/or are pursuing. If possible, include information on how competitive the funding is for each grant.

20. Internal Funding and Its Contribution to Scholarship

- Discuss grants you have received and/or are pursuing through USD, such as Faculty Research Grants. If possible, include information on how competitive the funding is for each grant.

Third Criterion: Service

21. Statement on Service

- Write a reflective statement about your approach and contributions to service.

Candidates may want to consider the following questions in your statement:

- a. What role do you see service playing in your professional life?
- b. How does your service relate to the other three criteria?
- c. What factors have impacted your choices with regards to service?
- d. If concerns about service have been raised in previous ARRT reviews, this may be an appropriate place to demonstrate how they have been addressed or resolved.
- e. What are your future goals with regards to service?
- f. How have you attempted to balance service with other demands such as scholarship and teaching?

22. Evidence of Service to USD

- List University wide committees (e.g., Senate, Budget, Calendar, Commencement), including length of time on committee and describe contributions to committee.
- List SOLES committees, including length of time on committee and describe contributions to committee. Program development and accreditation work can be described here.
- List program/department committees and activities, including department/program coordination, conference organization, guest lecturing for colleagues, admissions, others.

23. Evidence of Service to Profession

- Describe or list activities in professional organizations, for example, service as an officer, director or committee chair, reviewer for conferences or journals, etc.

24. Evidence of Service to the Community

- Describe or list volunteer service given to local or national helping or civic organizations (e.g. volunteering in a soup kitchen, or providing free consulting services to a non-profit organization).

Fourth Criterion: Support of the University of San Diego

25. Support for the Spiritual and Moral Orientation of the University

- Describe how your disposition and activities at work address the university's elaboration of the fourth criterion:

"Faculty members support the spiritual and moral orientation of the University of San Diego through their respect for Catholic Christianity and their recognition that the spiritual and moral aspects of the students' lives are significant. They have a sense of responsibility and concern towards the entire University community."

26. Evidence of Good Collegueship

- Address the ways in which you participate in and support the development of community in SOLES and USD. Letters from colleagues giving evidence of these contributions can be included.

Conclusion

27. Concluding Statement by Candidate

- Write a reflective statement about your overall body of work. The concluding statement can be an opportunity to provide a holistic statement about your record, allowing you to articulate the interconnectedness between your teaching, scholarship, service, and support of the University of San Diego.

If desired, the concluding statement is also an opportunity to summarize what you have learned from evaluating your work.

Selection of External Reviewers

Candidates for tenure and promotion are required to submit a list of external reviewers to the Dean by August 1st. Candidates may want to consider the following criteria when selecting which names to put forward.

1. Avoid submitting names for individuals with whom you have a friendship or other personal relationship. These individuals are unlikely to be approved since their ability to provide an objective evaluation will be questioned.
2. Avoid submitting names for individuals with whom you have had a close professional relationship. These individuals are unlikely to be approved since their ability to provide an objective evaluation will be questioned. Examples of close professional relationships might include faculty who have trained you, former colleagues, or individuals with whom you have done an extensive amount of collaboration (e.g., co-authored publications, co-presenter).
3. Ideally you should identify at least one and, if possible, two or more reviewers for each of your areas of scholarship you identify in your statement on research.
4. Reviewers with a strong reputation in the field will generally offer reviews with the greatest weight or credibility.

- If you select a potential reviewer that is not a faculty member within higher education, be sure to provide a clear rationale for the selection. Also, articulate why they have the necessary expertise to critically evaluate your scholarship.

ARRT Expedited Guide Template

The ARRT Guide Template (AGT) is a tool that candidates may use to structure an overview document for the ARRT committee for an expedited review. It is suggested that the overview document be no longer than two-single spaced pages (12 font). You should attach a copy of your CV to this document.

Identifying Information

Name of candidate:
 Academic Rank:
 Type or year review:
 Department or program:
 Date:

Criterion I - Teaching

- List the courses you taught by semester since the last review, including courses that you are currently teaching. Please list the course number, title, and number of students.
- Summarize the teaching evaluations you received for each course since the last review. (Items 1 and 2 can be summarized into a table like the example below.)
- Briefly describe any other teaching accomplishments (e.g., rewards) since your last ARRT review.
- Provide a brief commentary (one paragraph) on the changes you have made to teaching since your last ARRT evaluation. Where applicable, please indicate where you made changes as a result of the feedback you received in the past.
- Provide a brief narrative (one paragraph) on what your teaching goals will be prior to your next review.

Course #	Title	# Students	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4

Criterion II – Scholarship

- List all the books or books chapters you have published or had accepted (in press) since your last ARRT review.

2. List all the refereed journal articles that you have published or have had accepted (in press) since your last ARRT review.
3. List all the non-refereed journal articles that you have published or have had accepted (in press) since your last ARRT review.
4. List all of your refereed presentations since your last ARRT review.
5. List all of your non-refereed presentations since your last ARRT review.
6. List all of your other scholarship works since your last ARRT review that do not fall into the above categories. (Please specify the nature of the scholarship if it is not obvious.)
7. Provide a brief commentary (one paragraph) on your scholarship record since your last evaluation. Where applicable, please indicate where you made changes as a result of the feedback you received in the past.
8. Provide a brief narrative (one paragraph) on what your scholarship goals will be prior to your next review. Include a list of manuscripts or research currently in progress.

Criterion III – Service

1. List all of your SOLES and department/program committee assignments since your last review, including the semester(s) of service.
2. List all of your University committee assignments since your last review, including the semester(s) of service.
3. List all of your professional service activities since your last review, including the dates of service.
4. List all of your community service activities since your last review, including the dates of service.
5. Provide a brief commentary (one paragraph) on your service record. Where applicable, please indicate where you made changes as a result of the feedback you received in the past.
6. Provide a brief narrative (one paragraph) on what your goals will be prior to your next review.

Criterion IV – Mission

Provide a brief narrative on how your work supports the mission and values of the University.

Additional Reflections of the Candidate (optional):

If desired, the candidate can write a concluding summary. This may be the appropriate place to discuss the synergisms or relationships across the four criteria for tenure and reappointment (e.g., How does your research inform or transfer to teaching?).

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Approved by Faculty on May 13, 2009

Advancing from Associate Professor to Full Professor is never automatic or based solely on years of service. Rather, it represents a significant promotion that requires that the candidate meet challenging criteria in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and mission, the same areas that are used throughout the promotion and tenure process. The ARRT committee will review applications for promotion to the rank of full professor holistically; it is expected, however, that the candidate's file will include the following types of evidence:

Teaching

1. Evidence that the candidate has an exemplary teaching record. The evidence here most likely would be evaluation data from students and written commentaries by peers who observed and reviewed the candidate's teaching.
2. Evidence that the candidate has strived to improve her or his teaching and has been committed to on-going professional growth in the area of teaching. This evidence might include syllabi that illustrate major modifications that incorporate new research/scholarship and/or respond to student feedback, as well as reflective essays that describe changes in teaching strategies and the reasons why changes were made.
3. Evidence that the candidate has contributed to the changing needs of SOLES at a department and/or program level. The evidence here could include syllabi for new courses developed by the candidate; descriptions of the candidate's role in developing entirely new programs or programmatic initiatives within existing programs; or materials the candidate prepared for an accreditation team visit.

Scholarship:

1. Evidence that the candidate has made a significant professional contribution to her or his field of study at a national and/or international level. This might include such things as service on editorial boards, as peer-reviews, as dissertation committee members at other national and international institutions.
2. Evidence that the candidate has an extensive record of scholarly publications that illustrates sustained and focused contributions to his or her field. Typically, this would include a published book; articles in peer-reviewed journals; presentations at major academic conferences; and an identifiable line of scholarly inquiry that is likely to be pursued and extended after the candidate has become a full professor.

Service

1. Evidence that the candidate engages in service-related activities nationally and internationally. This evidence might include lists of service in leadership positions or on committees in research and/or professional associations and, ideally, essays or letters that provide accounts of the contributions that the candidate made while serving in at least some of the listed positions.
2. Evidence that the candidate has contributed in significant ways to the program area or department, SOLES and the University. The evidence here might include descriptions (written by both the candidate and others) of contributions made in a variety of SOLES positions and on different committees on which the candidate has served.
3. Evidence that the candidate mentors junior faculty. The evidence here could include letters from junior faculty members or such things as jointly authored publications.

Mission

1. Evidence that the candidate has worked in a manner that has been consistent with the stated mission of the university and has contributed in some way to achieving that mission. The evidence here might be a personal essay detailing, in specific terms, some of the things the candidate has done and how they link to the university's stated mission.
2. Evidence that the candidate consistently has acted in a professional and collegial manner. The evidence, here, most likely would be letters from colleagues both within and outside of the candidate's department or program.

Professor Emeritus Designation and Eligibility Criteria

Approved by Faculty 5/13/09

The emeritus designation for retiring SOLES faculty members can be considered for individuals who have served USD and the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the rank of professor with distinction for an extended time. Emeritus status recognizes tenured faculty who have excelled in the areas of teaching, research, service, and support of USD throughout their careers at the University. The award is intended as special recognition for individuals who have made outstanding career contributions to SOLES and who have a record of professional conduct that indicates support of the mission and values of the University of San Diego.

SOLES Procedure:

A recommendation for the rank of professor emeritus for an eligible candidate is submitted by the relevant department or program for initial consideration. A positive recommendation from the program or department is then forwarded to the Dean. This recommendation should include a brief summary of the candidate's distinguished record and qualifications for emeritus status. Nominations must be made no sooner than one year before and no later than one year after the date of retirement.

After nomination, the Dean will inform the ARRT committee and the candidate will be asked to provide a current CV and a statement summarizing his or her qualifications in support of the nomination for emeritus status. Qualifications should be summarized in relationship to the SOLES ARRT criteria for promotion and tenure. The ARRT committee shall have the right to request any additional information that is deemed necessary to make an appropriate decision, and will solicit input from the SOLES faculty. The ARRT committee will review the request and all input and will make a recommendation to the Dean.

The Dean will forward positive recommendations to the University Cabinet through the appropriate university process. The Dean will communicate the ARRT committee recommendation to the nominee. A candidate who is awarded emeritus status will be recognized at an appropriate SOLES event.

Eligibility requirements:

- The individual must have been tenured at USD and have attained the rank of Professor.
- The individual must have had at least ten years of full-time service at USD.
- The individual must be fully retired from USD before the title of emeritus can be bestowed.
- Posthumous awards may be considered.

ARRT Appeals Process

**Taken from USD Policies and Procedure Manual:
<http://www.sandiego.edu/legal/upolicies.php>*

SECTION NO.

HUMAN RESOURCES 2.4.6

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(As of July 16, 2010, this policy is effective for decisions made on or after September 1, 2010. To obtain a copy of the policy governing decisions made prior to September 1, 2010, please contact the Office of the General Counsel.)

4.6 Appeals from ARRT Decisions

These rules govern faculty grievances that relate to the University's decisions concerning faculty reappointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal. These rules are to be interpreted in light of the University's policy to resolve such grievances whenever possible within the school or college participating in the process by which the University's decision is made

A. ARRT Decision Defined

For purposes of these rules, an ARRT decision is a final decision made by the President of the University with respect to:

A faculty member's reappointment, rank, or tenure;

A faculty member's dismissal from and/or termination of employment, the criteria and procedures for which are governed at least in part by (a) the Policy for Reappointment, Rank and Tenure of the University of San Diego College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business Administration, School of Leadership and Education Sciences, School of Nursing and Health Science, and School of Peace Studies ("Rank and Tenure Policy"), (b) the University's policy governing dismissal for serious cause for schools or colleges other than the School of Law, or (c) the University's retrenchment policy.

If an ARRT decision denying tenure or promotion is meant to be final for the year for which the decision is made, then it is a "final decision" for purposes of these rules. An ARRT decision denying a promotion without denial of reappointment will only be reviewed in exceptional cases, since the normal recourse for the affected faculty member is to reapply.

When an ARRT decision is made, the President and/or the dean of the school or college in question will apprise the affected faculty member, promptly and in writing, of the decision, of the reasons for the decision, and of these appeals rules and procedures.

B. ARRT Appeals Panel and Committee

Faculty grievances with respect to ARRT decisions, the resolution of which are governed by these rules, are determined by an ARRT Appeals Committee acting in an advisory fact-finding and recommending capacity. An ARRT Appeals Committee is selected from the University's ARRT Appeals Panel.

1. ARRT Appeals Panel. The ARRT Appeals Panel ("Panel") consists of two members of the University's tenured faculty from each of the University's schools or college covered by the Rank and Tenure Policy.
 - a. Selection of ARRT Appeals Panel Members. Before April 1 of each year, the full-time faculty of each school or college covered by the Rank and Tenure Policy will elect two of its members and alternate(s) to serve one- year terms on the Panel.
 - b. To the extent possible, no member of the Panel may also be a member of a school's or college's ARRT Committee in the calendar year in which the ARRT decision was made.
 - c. No member of the Panel who has a conflict of interest or believes himself or herself to be biased with respect to a grievance or faculty grievant may be a member of the ARRT Appeals Committee that is to determine that grievance. The faculty grievant [see Section E of these rules, second paragraph] may challenge an ARRT Appeals Committee member or members to the Provost for cause.
 - i. If a Panel member of a school or college is disqualified from serving on an ARRT Appeals Committee, then the other Panel member from the disqualified member's school or college will be a member of that Committee.
 - ii. If the disqualified Panel member is from the faculty grievant's school or college, or if both Panel members of a school or college are disqualified from serving on an ARRT Appeals Committee, then an alternate will be selected; and, if all alternates are disqualified, then the faculty grievant and the dean of the pertinent school or college will select, by agreement, another tenured member or members of that school or college to serve as a member of the Committee that will determine the grievance in question.
2. Composition of the ARRT Appeals Committee. The ARRT Appeals Committee has five members. Two of its members will come from the faculty grievant's school or college; the other members will come one each from other schools or colleges covered by the Rank and Tenure Policy.
 - a. Except as provided in Section B.1.c, the Provost will select by lot the members of the ARRT Appeals Committee who are not from the faculty grievant's school or college.
 - b. In the case of an appeal from a decision to terminate a faculty member for serious cause, no member of the ARRT Appeals Committee may also have been a member of the committee that conducted the hearing in the dismissal for serious cause proceeding.
 - c. An ARRT Appeals Committee member may not be absent or abstain from any of the Committee's proceedings or determinations. If

illness or other unforeseen event prevents a Committee member from participating fully in the Committee's proceedings, then he or she will be deemed disqualified and replaced as provided in Section B.1.c.

3. **Advisory Nature of ARRT Appeals Committee Decisions.** Findings and decisions of the ARRT Appeals Committee are advisory only, and are made in the form of a recommendation to the President in a determination to (a) the President and Provost, (b) the program, department, school, or college that has participated in the ARRT decision in question, and/or (c) the faculty grievant who has appealed the ARRT decision.
4. **Confidentiality of ARRT Appeals Committee Proceedings.** Proceedings before the ARRT Appeals Committee are not public in character. To the extent permitted by law, every effort must be made by the Provost, by the ARRT Appeals Committee and its members, and by participants in proceedings before the ARRT Appeals Committee to maintain the non- public character and confidentiality of those proceedings and their resolutions.
5. **School of Peace Studies.** When the School of Peace Studies has at least five tenured faculty members: (a) the ARRT Appeals Panel will include two members of the tenured faculty from the School of Peace Studies; and (b) an ARRT Appeals Committee will be comprised of five members. Two of its members will come from the faculty grievant's school or College, and the other three members will be chosen by lot by the Provost, with no more than one committee member being from each of the other schools or the College.

While the School of Peace Studies has fewer than five tenured faculty members: (a) the ARRT Appeals Panel will not include members of the University's tenured faculty from the School of Peace Studies; and (b) if an ARRT Appeals Committee considers an appeal by a faculty grievant from the School of Peace Studies, all five members of the ARRT Appeals committee shall be chosen by lot by the Provost, and each of the other schools and the College shall be represented on the ARRT Appeals Committee.

C. Who May Appeal; When to Appeal

1. The following persons are entitled to appeal ARRT decisions as defined in Section A of these rules:
 - a. **Reappointment and Tenure:** by the faculty member who has finally been denied reappointment, or who has been offered reappointment on conditions other than those on which his or her original appointment was made.

- b. Promotion: by the faculty member who has been denied a promotion.
 - c. Dismissal: by the faculty member who has been dismissed due to retrenchment or for serious cause.
2. Time within which to appeal: All appeals must be commenced [see Section E.1] within 45 days of the date on which the last of the materials identified in the final paragraph of Section A of this policy are sent to the faculty member.

D. Grounds for Appeal; Burden of Proof

The ARRT Appeals Committee's advisory jurisdiction over ARRT decisions is limited to the determination whether or not the ARRT decision was properly made. The ARRT Appeals Committee's authority does not extend to, and it shall not consider, evidence of the grievant's activities (teaching, scholarship, etc.) that originated after the ARRT decision was made. The ARRT Appeals Committee will deem an ARRT decision to have been improperly made if, and only if, either of the following grounds is proved:

1. The procedure that, according to the applicable rules, should have been followed for the ARRT decision in question was not in fact followed, and the procedural violation had a material effect on the decision made.
2. The ARRT decision does not reasonably follow from the evidence presented to the person or body (generally the rank and tenure committee and/or the dean of the grievant's college or school) whose recommendation formed the basis of the ARRT decision as defined in Section A, first paragraph of these rules.

The ARRT Appeals Committee is to presume that the contested ARRT decision was properly made, and the faculty member(s) bringing the appeal must prove at least one of these grounds in order to prevail. The ARRT Appeals Committee should not consider evidence that the college or school's rank and tenure committee did not receive, whether created or produced prior to or after the latter committee's recommendation was made. Instead, the ARRT Appeals Committee should either ignore the additional evidence or suspend the appeal and return the matter to the latter committee for reconsideration of its decision in light of additional evidence.

F. Appeals Procedures

Faculty members who are entitled to appeal according to Section C of these rules are responsible for commencing these appeals procedures after a final ARRT decision. A "faculty grievant" for purposes of these rules is the faculty member who commences these appeals procedures. In commencing an appeal, the faculty grievant waives, in

relation to the Provost, President, and ARRT Appeals Panel, any entitlement to the confidentiality of a prior ARRT decision and its underlying proceedings.

1. Commencement of Appeal. The faculty grievant commences an appeal when the faculty member communicates in writing to the Provost the grounds for the appeal (Section “D”) and the related rationale or rationales for reversing the ARRT recommendation.
2. The Provost forms the Appeals Committee, convenes its first meeting, and provides the Committee with a copy of the grievant’s appeal and the documents of the ARRT Committee on the case. The Provost also transmits a copy of the grievant’s appeal to the dean, the chair of the ARRT Committee that made the recommendation, and to the grievant’s immediate supervisor, if not the dean.
3. The Appeals Committee selects its Chair, reviews materials supplied to it by the Provost, and decides by majority vote whether to:
 - a. recommend to the Provost that the grievant’s appeal appears to lack sufficient merit to proceed with further Appeals Committee deliberations; or
 - b. gather more information in writing in a timely manner from one or more of the following: dean, chair of the ARRT Committee, grievant, or other parties who may have perspective of utility to the Appeals Committee.
4. If ‘3.b’ is engaged, the Appeals Committee will re-convene to deliberate and decide to recommend one of the following:
 - a. The appeal lacks sufficient merit to require reconsideration;
 - b. The appeal may have sufficient merit and should be directed to the original ARRT Committee for reconsideration;
 - c. The appeal is convincing in that the negative decision may have been improperly made, and the President and Provost should create an ad hoc faculty panel to review the merits of the case which will include faculty who are from the academic unit or units represented in the ARRT Committee but not necessarily from the ARRT Committee which made the original recommendation.
5. The ARRT Appeals Committee will forward its recommendation to the President and Provost with copies to the grievant, ARRT Committee members who made the original recommendation, and to the dean of the academic unit. The recommendation may include separate statements from ARRT Appeals Committee members.

6. The President will make a decision within 45 days of receipt of the Appeals Committee recommendation; and
7. If a negative decision ensues from engaging options '4.b.' or '4.c.' above, this Appeals policy and procedure will not be available for further appeals.

6.3 Appointment, Support, and Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty

Appointment of Part-time Faculty

Part-time faculty members are identified in a variety of ways.

1) Professionals contact the dean's office and inquire about part-time opportunities. Part-time opportunities are listed on the SOLES website (homepage: "Positions"). Applicants are encouraged to submit paperwork electronically to the attention of the person listed in the announcement.

Once a person's application packet has been received, it is routed to the appropriate chair/director. It then becomes the responsibility of the director/chair to follow up with the applicant. When an unsolicited vitae is submitted, the chair or director will respond to the applicant in writing. Samples of form letters are available from the program's administrative assistant.

2) A second avenue for identifying part-time faculty is through nomination by full time faculty. The chair/director will inform faculty of courses needing a part-time professor and faculty will be encouraged to make nominations.

Each director/chair maintains a copy of the vita of possible part-time faculty. When the director/chair needs to employ a part-time person, an interview is arranged. Once the faculty is selected, the department informs the Budget and Operations Manager. So that a background check can be initiated. Once the background check is cleared, the dept. requests that a contract be processed. The Budget and Operations Office is responsible for sending the contract, a copy of the Part-time Faculty Handbook (also available on the SOLES website "Faculty Resources" page, and other materials as required by Human Resources.

Orientation and Support for Part-Time Faculty

Orientation procedures for new, part-time faculty vary by program. Once a part-time faculty member is hired, the chair/director either provides a small group or individualized orientation. Or, the part-time faculty member is assigned to a full time faculty member. Either method of orientation includes a review of the Part-time Faculty Handbook. Either

the chair/director or a faculty member serves as a mentor to any new part-time faculty. This means that the person meets with, and orients the new instructor, and is available to support this part-time person throughout the semester. The chair/director or his/her designee will attend one class of each new part-time faculty in order to evaluate his/her teaching during the first semester in SOLES. The chair/director will create an action plan if any areas needing attention are identified.

Most part-time faculty members have been with SOLES for several years and are kept informed of events in the following ways: 1) included in the weekly electronic updates from the dean's office; and/or, 2) included in the department/program list serve.

Evaluation and Feedback

All part-time faculty are evaluated by students at the end of each course. Copies of evaluations are summarized by the Office of Assessment). The director/chair reviews all part-time faculty evaluations each semester. Once the evaluations have been reviewed, one copy is placed in the chair/director's files and instructors can access their evaluations via the my.sandiego.edu portal. If assistance and further support are needed, it is the responsibility of the director/chair to ensure that feedback is given and support is provided.

Dean's Cabinet Revised and Approved April 2006
NCATE Accreditation 10/04

Attendance at SOLES and Department/Program Meetings

Faculty attendance at SOLES and department or program meetings is required. Faculty who must miss a SOLES meeting are requested to notify the Dean's office in advance of the meeting. Faculty who must miss a departmental or program meeting should notify the department chair or program director in advance of the meeting.

Budget Process

The decision-making period for budget preparation occurs from September--December each year. Department Chairs consult with faculty regarding needs and submit a program area recommendation which is clearly prioritized and with rationales. The need for new faculty in particular must be well documented, and directors typically consult with the Dean informally prior to submission of new faculty requests. Special expenses increases (e.g., telephones and supplies) must have strong rationales with particular attention to needs that support instruction. Renovation requests must be discussed with the Dean early, and directors submit these proposals in early-September. Directors receive instructions on

budget preparation in August with an early September due date to the Dean. The Dean reviews the recommendations and makes decanal recommendations to the Provost in mid-September.

The Dean and a faculty representative represent the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at University Budget Committee (UBC) meetings. The UBC is co- chaired by the Provost and Vice President, and Vice President for Finance and has a variety of administrative, faculty, staff, and student representatives. The UBC rarely examines program specific expenditures but rather gives direction to the Vice Presidents and Deans regarding parameters (e.g., should new personnel or financial aid be more or less important than merit pay?). Decisions on renovations and capital expenditures frequently occur after the beginning of the Spring semester since these recommendations substantially depend on the health of the current year budget.

Program areas are informed of new personnel additions by no later than November, but advertising of new and replacement faculty can begin earlier with the Dean's approval. Affirmative action policy must be adhered to in each instance. Department Chairs learn about other budget increases during January and February and should consult the Dean regarding reasons for unsuccessful requests and suggestions for future recommendations.

Budgetary requests outside of the normal budgetary process:

Sometimes expenditures or opportunities may arise that had not been considered during the budget process such as special software, computer accessories, and instructional supplies. As programs are allotted limited discretionary monies, any non-budgeted item must be requested through the department chair. The chairs may approve the request if funding allows or they may bring the request to the faculty in the department to ensure that the expense benefits the department as a whole. If there is no funding available and the departments deem the expense beneficial, the chair may bring the request to the Dean for review and support. These requests should be infrequent and will only be approved if the expense is deemed valuable and if funding allows.

Center for Educational Excellence

Through the Center for Educational Excellence (CEE) the university offers a variety of professional development opportunities aimed at improving teaching for part-time and full-time faculty. Please visit their website (www.sandiego.edu/cee) in order to see what programs are offered each semester. CEE is often seeking faculty to deliver workshops. If you are interested in doing so, please contact the CEE Director, Dr. Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, at ext. 4005. The Center for Educational Excellence is located in Copley Library, Room 211.

SOLES Committee Assignments 2014-2015

Updated: June 17, 2014

School of Leadership and Education Sciences SOLES-Wide Committee Assignments

1. **ARRT:**
Tenure-Track Only
Current Members: Cordeiro (Dean), Hubbard (DLT, 2nd of 2), Getz (DLS, 2nd of 2), Johnson (SFMHP, 1st of 2), Inoue (Chair, 1st of 2, at-large), Buczynski (1st of 2, at-large)
2. **ARRT Policy Advisory:**
Non-Tenure Faculty Only
Current Members: Molina (2nd of 2), Hall (1st of 2)
3. **Faculty Status:**
Tenure-Track Only
Current Members: Williams (SFMHP, 1st of 2), Hansen (DLT, 2nd of 2), Donmoyer (DLS, 2nd of 2), Newman (1st of 1, at-large)
4. **Curriculum:**
Tenure-Track Only
Current Members: Reed (Chair), Newman (DLS, 2nd of 2), Hansen (DLT, 1st of 2), Zgliczynski (SFMHP, 2nd of 2)
5. **University Professorship:**
Tenure-Track Only
Current Members: Inoue, Hubbard, Galloway
6. **SOLES Global Center:**

(SFMHP),
McConnell
Current Members: Reed (Chair), Dews, Molina (LT), Kalyanpur (LT) Zgliczynski
Donmoyer (DLS),
7. **Dean's Advisory Cabinet:**

Coughlan, Johnson
Current Members: Cordeiro (Chair), Reed, Dews, Lee, Lattimer (Sabbatical), Hubbard (Interim), Garland, Nahavandi, Stein, Council, Foster,
8. **Sustainability Committee:**
Current Members: Garofalo (Co-chair), Alexandrowicz, Gelb (Co-chair), Reed, Hetherington, Raimond, Coughlan, Degheri, Spencer, Martin, Mohamed, Sterk, Corona, Keicher, Foster, Dyer

SOLES ADVISORY BOARD SUBCOMMITTEES

- **Alumni Relations/Remarkable Leaders** Current Members: Smith, M. Martin, Mandell, Manley, Hovda, Abeyta, J. McDonald, Mantle, Hetherington

School of Leadership and Education Sciences University-Wide Committees 2014-2015

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. University Senate:
Tenure-Track Only

(Alternate)</p> | <p>Current Members: Ammer (1st of 2), Martin (2nd of 2), Reed (Alternate), Rowell</p> |
| <p>2. ARRT Appeals:
Tenure-Track Only
Edwards
(Alternate, 1st of 1), Alexandrowicz (Alternate, 1st of 1)</p> | <p>Current Members: Donmoyer (1st of 1), Williams (1st of 1),</p> |
| <p>3. University Professorship Oversight:

(2nd of 3)
*EOT for Galloway is 2016-17</p> | <p>Current Member:
Inoue, Interim Fall 2014
Galloway, Spring 2015</p> |
| <p>4. Academic Integrity:
Tenure-Track Only</p> | <p>Current Member: Martin</p> |
| <p>5. Academic Calendar Committee:
Tenure-Track Only</p> | <p>Current Member: Rowell</p> |
| <p>6. Library Committee:</p> | <p>Current Member: Spencer</p> |
| <p>7. Experiential Learning Committee:</p> | <p>Current Member: Getz</p> |
| <p>8. University Budget:
Tenure-Track Only</p> | <p>Current Member: Patterson</p> |
| <p>9. International Center Advisory:</p> | <p>Current Members: Dews, Inoue</p> |
| <p>10. Academic Program Review:
Tenure-Track Only</p> | <p>Current Member: Edwards (2nd of 3)</p> |
| <p>11. Institutional Review Board:
Tenure-Track Only

of 3)</p> | <p>Current Members: Patterson (3rd of 3), Garland (3rd of 3), Nahavandi (1st)</p> |
| <p>12. Center for Educational Excellence:
Tenure-Track Only</p> | <p>Current Member: Alexandrowicz (1st of 2)</p> |
| <p>13. WASC – Steering Committee</p> | <p>Current Member: Lee</p> |
| <p>14. Graduate Enrollment and Retention Support Services:</p> | <p>Current Members: Dews, Council</p> |

15. Commencement Committee:	Current Member: Dews
16. School of Nursing ARRT Committee:	Current Member: Ammer
17. Parking and Transportation:	Current Member: Stein
18. Faculty Grievance Tenure-Track Only	Current Members: Spencer, Nahavandi
19. School of Peace Studies ARRT Committee: Tenure-Track Only	Current Member: Spencer
20. Information Technology Advisory Council Quezada 2015)	Current Members: Inoue, Estrada (Fall 2014), (Spring
21. University Research Council	Current Members: Hubbard, Garland
22. University Data Integrity Committee	Current Members: Lee, Council
23. Space Committee	Current Member: Stein (1 st of 3)
24. University Core Curriculum Committee of 1)	Current Member: Quezada (1 st
25. Community of Human Resources Committee En	Current Members: Gibb, Poeu-

Structure and Responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee

University of San Diego
School of Leadership and Education Sciences
Revised July 2014

As a committee of the faculty of the School of Leadership and Education Sciences, the Curriculum Committee's charge is to make recommendations to the faculty for action on issues regarding curriculum matters. The committee will also provide a formalized body that supports the development of curriculum and instruction.

Membership of the Curriculum Committee

1. Membership of the Curriculum Committee shall include the Associate Dean and a faculty member representing each department.
2. Faculty members are elected during the spring semester.
3. Faculty members will serve a two-year term.
4. The Associate Dean is the Chair of the Committee.

General Functions of the Curriculum Committee

1. Support communication, coordination and development of curriculum and instruction across the School of Leadership and Education Sciences (e. g. reviews and disseminates information that impacts more than one program within the School of Leadership and Education Sciences).
2. Review and evaluate proposals for curriculum changes.
3. Consider curriculum-related matters, which the Dean and/or faculty asks the committee to study (e. g., developing SOLES draft policy regarding curriculum and instruction.)

Duties of the Curriculum Committee

1. Review and evaluate proposals for new courses.
2. Review and evaluate proposals for course revisions. A course revision will be reviewed only if the intent is to substantially change the description of a course.
3. Review and evaluate proposals to eliminate courses and/or programs.
4. Review and evaluate proposals for new programs.
5. Make recommendations to the faculty for approval.
6. Participate in special curriculum-related projects at the request of the faculty and/or Dean.

The Duties and Responsibilities of the Chair are to

1. Convene the committee for meetings.
2. Insure minutes are taken each meeting.
3. Insure that the composition of the committee is correct according to the membership guidelines.
4. Announce committee meeting dates and submission deadlines to the full faculty.
5. Communicate actions taken by the committee and the reasons for such actions to Department Chairs and the Dean. If problems arise relative to program course requests, these should be explained to the chair and resolved.
6. Communicate the committee's recommendations to the full faculty.
7. Report actions taken by the full faculty to the Office of the Registrar.

Role of the Members of the Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee will meet monthly during the academic year, or on call of the chairperson. Meeting times will be announced by October 1 for the fall semester, and December 15 for the spring semester.

The responsibilities of the members are:

1. Attend all scheduled meetings.
2. Communicate with faculty concerning curricular matters.
3. Make professional judgments and informed decisions that are in the best interest of the faculty and students of SOLES.

Procedures for the Submission of Course/Program Proposals

- I. All proposals must be reviewed and approved by the faculty of the originating program/department and signed by the program director/department chair.
- II. If the proposal has significant budgetary implications, it should be discussed with the Dean prior to approval by the program.
- III. The Course/Program Action Sheet must be completed and forwarded electronically, along with supporting materials, to the curriculum committee, by the deadlines posted by the curriculum committee (usually 1 week prior to when the curriculum committee meets).

- IV. Following review of the proposal, the committee may decide to (1) recommend approval by the full faculty; or (2) send the proposal back to the program director/chair with requests for modifications and/or additional information.
- V. Approved proposals are forwarded to the Dean for budgetary review.
- VI. Dean signs off on Course/Program Action Sheet, and returns it to the curriculum committee chair.
- VII. Signed proposals are then sent to full faculty for approval / discussion at the following SOLES meeting.
- VIII. If approved by full faculty, copies of the Course Action Sheet and supporting materials are forwarded to the Dean's office and the Vice Provost for the purpose of record keeping.

Course Proposals

Proposals to add, drop, or change courses are initiated by completing the following format:

- I. Procedures for New Course Proposals and Proposals to Significantly Change the Intent of Existing Courses.
 - B. Completion and electronic submission of the Course/ Program Proposal Action Sheet. This form can be found on the Handbooks, Policies and Forms and website: http://usd.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_1Fy7fmJ0MYNHJKI
- II. Course Drops
 - A. Completion of the Course/Program Action Sheet

Programs affected by the drop should be consulted since it may be necessary for them to revise their program.

III. Experimental Course Guidelines

A. Introduction

Courses numbered 579 are to be used by programs for experimental purposes. These numbers allow programs to:

- 1. Assess student interest in a particular area before instituting formal course application, and
- 2. Offer courses that are of a non-recurring nature or which have somewhat transient relevance.

B. Policies and Procedures

1. Experimental courses must be approved by program/department faculty and Chair. (Program faculty should discuss student needs, faculty load issues, and impact on other course enrollments, etc.)
2. Experimental courses are submitted to the committee using the Course Action/Program Action Sheet.
3. Experimental courses are submitted to the curriculum committee for informational purposes only, and forwarded to the Dean for budgetary review.
4. Experimental courses with the same content may be offered twice only under the 579 rubric.
5. After two offerings, the course must be submitted to the program/department faculty as a permanent course, to be offered again.
6. Department Chair re-submits the course to the curriculum committee (using Course Action Sheet) for review.
7. Curriculum Committee reviews course following the regular procedures for new course submissions.

C. Completion of the Course/Program Action Sheet

Submit a Course/Program Action Sheet and a Course Proposal to the Curriculum Committee Chair for communication to the faculty. Experimental courses are not formally reviewed by the committee until submitted as a permanent course.

Program Proposals

Proposals to add, drop, or significantly change a program are initiated by completing the following process, in the format described:

- I. Procedures for New Program Proposals and Proposals to Significantly Change the Intent of Existing Programs.
 - A. Completion and electronic submission of the Course/ Program Proposal Action Sheet. This form can be found on the Handbooks, Policies and Forms and website: http://usd.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_1Fy7fmJ0MYNHJKI
 - B. Other requirements
 1. All new programs and/or substantive changes within the program/department, (such as degree change, or new credential or program area) must be approved by program/dept. faculty, curriculum committee, Dean and appropriate university and accrediting bodies (Vice Provost)

where applicable. Additional instructions for new academic programs can be found at:

<http://www.sandiego.edu/provost/docs-forms/academic-initiatives-procedures.php>

2. Program/dept. faculty, curriculum committee and Dean must approve specialization changes. Faculty and Program Director / Chair should confer with appropriate accrediting bodies (if applicable) to insure compliance.

Evaluation of Supervisors

All University personnel involved in the supervision of student teachers, practica, field placements, and internships shall be formally evaluated by the student(s) at the conclusion of the experience provided they meet the minimum number of respondents required to insure anonymity. These evaluations shall be submitted to the appropriate Department Chair, and shared with the faculty member in the same manner as regular course evaluations.

University personnel who serve as supervisors for student teaching, practica, field placements and internships, will informally evaluate the students' site supervisors (non-University personnel). Such evaluations, which may include student feedback, shall be reported to the appropriate Program Director/Department Chair. Reports need not be in writing, and are to be used solely for the purpose of future student placement.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

<http://www.sandiego.edu/legal/policies/community/institutional/privacy.pdf>

General Privacy Provisions

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) limits the distribution of educational records in order to protect the privacy of students. Educational records are divided into two categories: directory information and non-directory information. Directory information may be released to anyone unless the student requests the information be kept confidential. At USD, directory information consists of the following six items: name, e-mail address, major field of study, dates of attendance, participation in officially recognized activities and sports, plus degrees, honors, and awards received. All other personally identifiable information is non-directory information, which may not be released to anyone outside USD without the student's written permission. An exception exists for parents of dependent students, who must be allowed access to any information that the student would have access to. At USD, all undergraduate students are assumed to be dependents of their

parents unless the student proves otherwise, while all graduate/law students are assumed to independent of their parents unless the parents prove otherwise. USD employees with a legitimate need to know may access whatever educational records they require in order to perform their job function. (Taken from University of San Diego College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Handbook, 2008-2009)

Posting of Grades and Distribution of Graded Material

Faculty may not post grades in any manner that could reveal the grade of a particular student. Thus grades may not be posted by name, ID number, or social security number, unless written consent to do so is obtained from the student. Faculty may post grades by codes known only to each student provided that the grades are not posted in alphabetical order. Faculty may not leave graded materials in places where they are accessible to students. This includes leaving stacks of laboratory reports or student papers outside one's door for student pick-up, passing back a homework assignment by sending out all the papers in one stack for the students to look through, or any other method where a student sorts through other students' work in order to find his or her own materials. (Taken from University of San Diego College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Handbook, 2008-2009)

FERPA Training & Certification

All SOLES employees must become familiar with the law and must demonstrate that they have such familiarity. To aid employees in gaining this familiarity, as well as to enable USD to show that its employees are knowledgeable regarding FERPA, a website has been created that contains information about and a tutorial on FERPA:

<http://www.sandiego.edu/registrar/ferpa/>

Please go to the website noted above and become familiar with its organization. Note that in the light blue column on the left, there is a table of contents. Please read the entire main section and the sections for students, parents, faculty, and staff for a comprehensive overview of the law. You will see, in the blue column, a reference to a Tutorial. Once you have read through the materials at this website thoroughly, you will need to take the Tutorial. There are questions that must be answered correctly throughout the Tutorial in order for you to move to the next screen. Incorrect answers will not allow you to progress. This is why you need to read through the full website before taking the Tutorial with its embedded questions.

At the end of the Tutorial, there is a form, which you will need to complete. Once you have passed and completed the Tutorial, you will be automatically registered as having successfully completed the necessary training in matters relating to FERPA as amended. You may print out a copy of your completion certificate for your records if you wish.

In order to comply with the federal mandate, ALL employees who function as "school officials" MUST complete the Tutorial. Please complete at your earliest

convenience. The Provost's Office is responsible for assuring compliance with the law, and persons who do not complete the tutorial will be contacted and asked to do so.

Employees must also have a current USD email address which must be used for all student and university-related correspondence. (*To create a USD email address & account please see the following website: <http://mail.sandiego.edu/>)

Please contact Dr. Thomas Herrinton, Associate Provost, at x4553 for additional information.

Grants

The SOLES Dean's office, in cooperation with the Office of Sponsored Programs, is committed to supporting SOLES faculty and administrators in seeking and obtaining external funds for research and development. Support includes consultation regarding possible projects, the identification of potential sources of funding, the development and submission of proposals, and the implementation and monitoring of grants that are funded. To assure the proper tracking and timely routing of grant proposals please:

- Notify the Associate Dean when you begin to work on a grant proposal. It is his responsibility to track and support your effort and to assure coordination with the Budget and Operations Manager and the Office of Sponsored Programs.
- Allow sufficient time (at least a couple of days) for the review and/or signing off on your proposal by the Dean, Budget and Operations Manager, Provost, Office of Sponsored Programs, and Chair (for faculty in departments). Because USD has a routing system for submission of grant proposals that requires the participation of several offices grants cannot be turned in at the last moment in the expectation that they can be immediately sent out.

If you are interested in federal and state grant information contact the office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) or visit: www.sandiego.edu/sponsored-programs/. You can be added to an electronic list serve that notifies you of grant opportunities in your areas of interest.

Annette Ketner, Office of Foundation Relations, can provide assistance in identifying possible grant opportunities with private foundations. Please note that university policy requires that you first contact Ms. Kettner's office before applying to a private foundation. Similarly, if you are applying for a state or federal grant, then OSP will assist in writing the grant and obtaining the appropriate signatures (department chair, dean, and provost).

Resources for Researchers including access to forms and training opportunities may be found at

Grant Preparation, Pre-Award

The USD Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) is not only a source for obtaining institutional forms, but also for identifying funding sources; assisting with proposal preparation; and reviewing proposals as well as obtaining signatures for signing off on proposal submittal. Please visit the OSP website (<http://www.sandiego.edu/sponsored-programs/>). If there is additional information needed in regards to submitting grants, please to contact the OSP office at 619-260-6825.

Importance of Early Coordination

It is very important for Principal Investigators to recognize the advantages of early feasibility discussions with the appropriate Chair/Dean to ascertain initial information as to whether a proposed program is consistent with the University's mission, size and resources. This is particularly true for proposed programs that will require any costs, space, equipment or other services to be provided by USD.

The Dean's Office and the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) can assist in budget preparation and review guidelines with Principal Investigators to point out any obstacles to be dealt with early in the process (cost sharing requirements, consortia or subcontract documentation, etc.). Where appropriate, the OSP will provide applicable Facilities and Administration rates, Fringe Benefit rates, or other applicable rates as well as other basic information needed in the proposal.

As a further note, Principal Investigators should be aware that if other individuals, including those employed at USD, and/or outside organizations will be included in the proposed research, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain their agreement to participate as well as the approval of their respective departments or organizations. Doing this as early in the process as appropriate, and communicating these requirements to the OSP from the beginning, will better enable the proposal submission deadlines to be met in a timely manner.

Department Chairs

The Department Chair reviews and approves the proposal being submitted to verify that the Principal Investigator can effectively manage the program given other academic and administrative commitments, as well as to confirm that proposals and programs are in accord with department/school objectives. The Chair assesses the adequacy of the budget and how it will impact departmental finances and reviews for any additional space or cost sharing requirements given the scale of the program. In signing a grant routing form, the Chair also accepts financial responsibility for the department for any eventual overruns and/or cost disallowances. The Chair also approves certain expenses or actions related to

the program such as stipend payments, tuition, new hires, and cost sharing commitments. Where possible, the Chair provides departmental assistance in preparing and submitting appropriate documentation for financial and other administrative transactions.

Dean

The Dean's Office reviews the proposal to verify that the faculty member is eligible to be a Principal Investigator and can effectively manage and properly conduct the proposed program. The Dean's Office also reviews budgets, gives official approval to any cost-sharing commitments or provisions for additional resources, and confirms that proposals and programs are in accord with department/school objectives. The Dean's Office will accept financial responsibility for any eventual overruns and/or cost disallowances, and will often provide local administrative support for the program once funded.

Routing of preliminary grant documents and proposals:

Letter of inquiry

A "Letter of Inquiry" is a general presentation of a program idea designed to elicit feedback from a potential sponsor. **No commitment should be made in the letter. Letters of inquiry do not require Dean's office and OSP review and no formal routing is required, providing that no commitments are made.**

Concept papers

The prospective sponsor may request concept papers. Concept papers tend to be approximately two- to-four pages in length, and they highlight key features of the anticipated proposal. Normally, these are sent to the program officer after telephone conversation requesting permission to submit a concept paper. The program officer may comment on areas to highlight, what should be avoided, and activities that should be included. Generally, in shortened form, these would include:

Project title; Statement of need - with relevance to sponsor's mission; Goals and objectives – overall goal, specific objectives, quantifiable; Methodology - related to objects, anticipates questions, objections, snags; Resources and personnel; **Generalized budget - with cost sharing (if required), which should be coordinated with OSP to verify that it does not commit the University and the information is accurate.**

Letter of intent

A "Letter of Intent" expresses the intention to submit a proposal in response to a particular program announcement or request for proposals. Letters of Intent to form a consortium are often required for submissions to NIH where USD will be a partner with the lead university. Agencies generally require that such letters present only a general statement of the intended program theme. If the letter of intent contains budget estimates or representations, it must be reviewed and approved by the Dean's office and OSP prior to submission. The Provost will sign the letter as an indication of the institution's concurrence with the planned submission.

Preliminary proposals (pre-proposals)

Preliminary proposals, like letters of intent, are generally solicited by the sponsor. A preliminary proposal usually includes a one- to five-page program description. It may also require a draft budget and some indication of USD's willingness to support the program through a commitment of resources. **Any document that mentions budget figures or commits USD personnel, facilities, and/or other resources requires Dean's office, OSP review and institutional signature approval before the proposal is submitted.**

Faculty Research Grants

I. DEFINITION

For the purpose of awarding faculty research grants, the sine qua non of research/scholarship is the creation of a substantial scholarly product that is intended for dissemination beyond the School of Leadership and Education Sciences. Therefore, publication is understood to be the aim of research/scholarship. However, "to publish" is understood in the very broad sense of "to make publicly or generally known." The School of Leadership and Education Sciences recognizes that faculty members may legitimately choose to disseminate their work through any number of traditional or non-traditional channels, depending upon the audience with whom they wish to communicate.

Examples of activities that, in themselves, do not qualify for faculty research grant awards include writing or rewriting program documents for credentialing, working to obtain licenses or credentials, revising course syllabi, developing new courses, preparing documents for accreditation agencies, or any other activities that do not culminate in a substantial scholarly product that is imbued with intellectual ambition and intended for an audience beyond the School of Leadership and Education Sciences.

II. ELIGIBILITY

Only tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences shall be eligible for faculty research grant awards. Each faculty member may only submit one proposal per year.

III. PROPOSAL GUIDELINES

1. *Coversheet:* The cover sheet must contain your name; title of proposal, running heading that reflects the intent of the project (in upper right corner of every page). Also include on the cover page the amount of assigned time and/or funds requested and the semester in which you plan to do the research.

2. *Previous FRG Award Status Sheet:* On a second sheet stapled to the cover sheet, list the semester and year of your last two FRGs. Describe the results of each of your last two research awards (this can be the one page report required under Section V. Reporting/Disseminating). If less than two FRGs have been received, so indicate on the sheet. This information is kept with the Dean's Administrative Assistant and it is not attached to the material disseminated to the Faculty Status Committee during the review process. The cover sheet and previous FRG status sheets are used as part of the oversight process after the recommendations for rank order of proposals have been forwarded to the Dean.
3. *Proposal Summary Sheet:* On a separate page entitled Proposal Summary Sheet answer the following questions:
 - 1) Title of proposed faculty research grant proposal
 - 2) Type of credit/amount of unit release requested
 - 3) If you are requesting course release, please indicate the semester and year during which you would use the release time
 - 4) Rationale for award: Complete a brief statement (100-200 words) explaining why you think your project merits an award. Indicate ways the project might lead to professional dissemination of your research, including publications or conference proceedings that might be generated from your findings
 - 5) Have you received an FRG within the past three years? If so, during what semesters/years?
 - 6) Is your FRG Proposal
 - ___A New Project or Initiative
 - ___A work in progress not previously funded by a FRG
 - ___A work in progress or continuation of a project previously funded by an FRG
 - 7) What is the word count of your proposal (excluding references?)
4. *Length and Formatting of the Proposal:* The abstract should contain no more than 150 words. The proposal itself should not be more than 3000 words (excluding references). Proposals that exceed specified lengths will not be considered for awards. Proposals should be double spaced and a clear and consistent formatting style should be used throughout the proposal. Because proposals will be blindly reviewed, no identifying information should be included in the body of the proposal
5. *Content of Proposal:* The body of the proposal should consist of the following:
 - 1) Abstract
 - 2) Statement of the Problem and its Significance: This section should establish a need for the project that is being proposed. The need could be practical and/or theoretical. Appropriate citations should be used in framing the problem that the project will address and in demonstrating its significance.

- 3) Purpose of the Project (and, if the project is a research study, the research questions): In this section, the proposal writer should indicate how the project relates to the problem articulated in the prior section.
 - 4) Procedures: This section should describe in specific terms the procedures – qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods—that will be used in the proposed study along with a rationale for using these procedures. If the proposal is for funding to write about an already completed study, both the procedures that were used to generate the research findings to be reported should be detailed and detailed discussion of (a) the organization of the proposed paper and (b) the process that will be used to write the paper should be presented. Proposals for books, book chapters, and articles that will not report the results of a particular research study also should detail (a) the organizational structures of the material to be produced and (b) the procedures that will be used to complete the writing task. If what is being proposed is part of a larger and longer-term initiative, this section should provide an overview of the overall procedures that have been or will be employed and a more in-depth discussion of the procedures that will be used in the portion of the project for which support is requested. If the proposal writer has received other Faculty Research Grants to support work on other aspects of the larger initiative, copies of the proposals for these initiatives (minus any information that would reveal the identity of the faculty member) should be appended to this proposal.
 - 5) Tentative Timeline for Project Completion.
 - 6) A Dissemination Plan
 - 7) A Discussion of Human Subject Issues
 - 8) A List of References (As noted above, the reference list will not be counted in the 3,000 word limit.)
6. *Submission of FRG Proposal:* All FRG proposals are to be submitted electronically to another staff person designated by the dean by noon on the date the proposals are due. (The due date will be announced each year by the Faculty Status Committee.) Two files should be submitted. One should include the cover page and the Previous FRG Awards Status Sheet along with the proposal. The second file should contain only the proposal that does not reveal the identity of the author.
 7. *Document Submission:* The cover page and previous FRG Award Status Sheet should be stapled together and attached to One copy of the. Proposal summary sheet and actual proposal with no indication of submitter should be stapled together as a separate document. Both documents should be paper clipped together and submitted to the Dean's Administrative Assistant.
 8. *Coding:* The Dean's Administrative Assistant will code the proposals and remove the 2 cover pages.

IV. CRITERIA FOR SELECTING BETWEEN COMPETING FACULTY REQUESTS FOR RESEARCH GRANTS

1. Fidelity to SOLES' definition of research and scholarship.
2. Demonstration that the project requires the amount of reassigned time or funding that is requested.
3. Scope and significance of the project.
4. Appropriateness of plans for completing the project.
5. Evidence that completion of the project is likely.

Within a month after the Spring cutoff date, and after the Faculty Status Committee validates inter-rater reliability, proposals will be blindly and separately reviewed and ranked by each committee member. Following discussion, the committee will jointly rank all proposals and submit their ranked list to the dean. Ultimate discretion for awarding FRGs rests with the dean.

RUBRIC TO BE USED IN ASSESSING FACULTY RESEARCH GRANT PROPOSALS

The Problem and its Significance

- **5 Points:** The author clearly articulates a problem and establishes its significance by developing a convincing argument and citing appropriate literature.
- **3 Points:** The author attempts to identify a problem and demonstrate its significance, but either the description of the problem is not as clear as it should be or the argument about its significance is not as convincing as it could have been.
- **1 Points:** The author attempts to identify a problem and demonstrate its significance, but the description of the problem is not as clear as it should be and the argument about its significance is not as convincing as it could have been.
- **0 Points:** It is virtually impossible to understand the author's problem and/or the author's argument about its significance.

The Purpose (and, if Appropriate, the Research Questions)

- **5 Points:** The author clearly articulates a purpose for the project that is (and, in the case of research studies, articulates research questions that are) consistent with and respond to the problem that was identified.
- **3 Points:** The author attempts to articulate a purpose (and, when appropriate, research questions), but the discussion of the purpose either is not as clear as it should be or the purpose articulated does not directly respond to the problem identified.
- **1 Points:** The author attempts to articulate a purpose (and, if appropriate, research questions) but the discussion is neither clear nor directly responsive to the problem that was identified.
- **0 Point:** The purpose section of the proposal is virtually impossible to understand.

The Procedures

- **5 Points:** The author clearly articulates procedures to be used in executing the project and also presents a convincing rationale for using the identified procedures, a rationale that, among other things, links the procedures with the identified purpose.
- **3 Points:** The author attempts to articulate procedures but either there is not enough detail for the reviewer to picture what the author will actually do or the rationale for using the identified procedures is not adequate.
- **1 Points:** The author attempts to articulate inquiry procedures, but there is not enough detail for the reviewer to picture what the proposal will do and the rationale for using the identified procedures is inadequate.
- **0 Points:** It is virtually impossible for the reviewer to even imagine what the proposal writer intends to do, much less to understand the rationale that supports the procedures.

Language and Formatting Issues

- **5 Points:** The proposal is written in the format specified, is easy to understand and generally free of technical errors (e.g., typos).
- **3 Points:** The proposal is mostly easy to understand, but sometimes less than precise language and/or other technical errors require(s) the reader to reread sentences and/or whole sections of the proposal.
- **1 Points:** The proposal is often difficult to understand because of the author's less than precise language and/or other technical errors.
- **0 Points:** The proposal is often incomprehensible because of problematic writing.

The Scope of Work

- **5 Points:** The scope of work is consistent with the resources requested. In other words, the work described is clearly executable within the amount of time requested (e.g., 3 unit release equivalent to 51 hours of actual time spent on named project)
- **3 Points:** The scope of work seems either too large or too small for the resources requested.
- **1 Point:** The scope of work is totally unrealistic, given the resources that have been asked requested.
- **0 Points:** It is virtually impossible to determine the scope of work from the proposal.

Dissemination Plan

- **5 Points:** The dissemination plans described are comprehensive, specific and realistic.
- **3 Points:** Either the dissemination plans are not specific or they do not appear to be realistic.
- **1 Points:** The dissemination plans are neither specific nor realistic.

- **0 Points:** Dissemination plans are not discussed in the proposal.

V. REPORTING/DISSEMINATING

The faculty member is to file a one-page report (see appendix) no later than October 1 of the subsequent year with the Associate Provost and one copy with the Dean. If the project has not been completed by the end of the fiscal year, the faculty member will file a progress report by October 1st; this report will include a section on the use of the funds allocated.

At the beginning of each academic year, the chair of the Faculty Status Committee will be given a list of the previous year's grantees. The committee will then decide upon an appropriate forum to allow award recipients to share their work with colleagues. Such a forum will be held at a faculty meeting sometime each fall and spring semesters and will be convened by the Faculty Status Committee. Each award recipient is responsible for committing to and presenting the results and or progress of the work they completed with the FRG they were awarded. Failure to make this presentation may impact future grant awards to faculty members.

VI. LETTERS OF AWARD

When awards are made, an award letter will be issued by the Dean with a copy to the Provost, specifying the amount and nature of the award (or incorporating by reference the proposal which has been approved), and notifying faculty of the procedures and time deadlines. Non-expendable equipment remains the property of the University. Requests for funds, purchase requisitions, etc., should be finalized by June 1st, so as to be processed before the close of the fiscal year. There may be June payments, but these will have been authorized in advance. If special circumstances require June check requests, purchase requisitions, or the like, specific arrangements with the Dean must be made in advance.

SOLES Global Faculty Grants

The purpose of the SOLES Global Faculty Grants program is to help SOLES internationalize the curriculum by promoting collaborative research on international themes and/or by exposing faculty to different cultures and languages. The committee will evaluate proposals on the strength of their connection to SOLES' internationalization goal and to the perceived benefit towards increasing faculty members' research programs or language fluency. The committee will consider how the proposed project will strengthen the faculty member's scholarship and build a scholar's long-term international research agenda.

Selection Criteria

- Quality and significance of the proposal;
- Thoughtfulness given to its applicability to research and publication on international themes and/or from various cultural perspectives.

- The proposal should show evidence that the faculty member will deepen his/her understanding of their field of study within other cultural contexts and/or about international and/or language and culture issues.

Guidelines for SOLES Global Faculty Grants

All proposals submitted must deal with either international topics in your field of teaching and scholarship, or language/culture learning. International research implies that the scholarship you undertake will examine practices within that particular context or from the perspective of that context; this might mean research in another country or about another country

Priority is given to proposals for:

- International research with colleagues in at least one other nation or culture;
- International research with at least one SOLES student involved;
- Travel to another nation with the primary purpose of supporting or developing course contacts and materials for future course offerings.

Possible Evidence to be submitted once the project is completed and before another grant is awarded (only one may be selected):

- Refereed article accepted for publication (\$5,000). If submitting an article with multiple authors from SOLES, proposal must indicate how funds are to be distributed.
- Non-refereed article accepted for publication (\$1,000)
- Book contract with publisher (\$2,500)
- Book chapter accepted for publication (\$1,500)
- Editor of special issue of journal (\$1,500)
- Creation of a new syllabus or thoroughly revised existing course syllabus (\$500)
- Evidence of increased language fluency (\$2,000)
- Documented visits to organizations, universities, sites abroad as planning for future course offerings. (up to \$2,000)

Steps:

1. Complete the application: "SOLES Global Grant Proposal Form" (page 2)
2. Once the proposal is approved by the Global Grants Committee, be sure to keep the approved copy of the proposal form.
3. Once the project is completed, submit appropriate evidence.
4. Monetary award will be made.

SOLES Global Faculty Grant Proposal Form

If you plan to include student(s) in your project, your proposal can include how you will use the monetary award to support the student.

Faculty Global Grant submission form may be found here:

<http://www.sandiego.edu/soles/documents/SOLESGlobalFacultyGrants2013.pdf>

Please note the deadlines of October 1 and April 1, with only one proposal per fiscal year accepted.

Guidelines:

All tenure track and tenured SOLES faculty are eligible to apply. However, applicants can only be funded for one project per semester and the project cannot be tied to a Faculty Research Grant (FRG) Or International Opportunity Grant (IOG). Project cannot be retroactively awarded.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Proposals

IRB Proposals from SOLES faculty and students are facilitated through the doctoral programs office. Once your proposal (or your student's proposal) is complete and the Proposal Cover Sheet is signed by the researcher and faculty sponsor (if necessary), you can submit it to the Executive Assistant in the doctoral programs office. S/he will then facilitate and track the progress of the remaining approvals needed, first by the SOLES' IRB Representative and then by the Dean. Finally, the proposal will be hand delivered to the incumbent Chair of the IRB for review. Proposals for exempt review and expedited review are handled on an ongoing basis by the Associate Provost and IRB Administrator. The Institutional Review Board meets monthly to review proposals for full review. You will then be notified of approval directly from the Provost's office.

Please refer to the website,

<http://www.sandiego.edu/administration/academicaffairs/irb/>, for details regarding proposal requirements and the IRB meeting schedule.

IRB Proposal Preparation Guide

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Document for the School of Leadership and Education Sciences

Lee Williams, PhD

Revised 5-19-2008

Purpose: The purpose of this document is to aid faculty and students in preparing their proposals for review by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). This material is intended to supplement (but not replace) the materials provided by the University of San Diego IRB, which can be found at (<http://www.sandiego.edu/provost/irb/>) and in the policy manual (6.0.2). This document also presumes that you have done the necessary training and are familiar with ethical guidelines for conducting research.

Step One: Determine if your project qualifies as research.

Federal regulations (45 CFR 46) provide the following definition for research – “Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.”

Based on this definition, the following would NOT be considered research, and therefore would NOT require IRB approval.

- a. Classroom assignments where students conduct research projects with the sole purpose of learning the research method technique. If the sole purpose were to learn research method techniques, then the assignment would not meet the definition of contributing to generalizable knowledge. The instructor should insure that any research project conducted by students follows ethical principles and that there is only minimal risk to participants.
- b. Projects that are used to evaluate instructional practice for an individual teacher (with no intention of generalizing the findings to other teachers) would not qualify as research. In a similar manner, projects used to evaluate the professional practice of an individual administrator, counselor, or therapist would not qualify as research provided the findings would not generalize to others.
- c. Projects that are used to evaluate instructional or administrative practices within a specific program or organization would not qualify as research (provided that the results are not anticipated to generalize to other programs or organizations).
- d. Projects that evaluate the needs, attitudes, or opinions regarding the function of a specific program or organization would not qualify as research (provided that the results are not anticipated to generalize to other programs or organizations).

Based on the definition provided in 45 CFR 46, the following would be considered research and would potentially require IRB oversight:

- a. Any project required for a master’s thesis or doctoral thesis. Findings from a thesis are made available to others, and thus would be considered as contributing to generalizable knowledge.
- b. Any project that is conducted with the intent or potential of sharing the findings with other individuals (e.g., publications, presentations, etc.) would qualify as research since it could contribute to generalizable knowledge.
- c. Any research project conducted through a class where the results are expected to be shared with others beyond the instructor (e.g., publication, presentation), or there is a reasonable expectation that the project findings could result in a publication or presentation (or some other form of dissemination). In this particular case, the projects could be seen as contributing to generalizable knowledge.
- d. Any research project assigned by a program where the results are expected to be shared with others beyond the student’s advisor and/or committee (e.g., publication, presentation), or there is a reasonable expectation that the project findings could result in a publication or presentation (or some other form of dissemination). In this particular case, the projects could be seen as contributing to generalizable knowledge.
- e. Any research project conducted in a class or program that is a pilot study for another study that is expected to contribute to generalizable knowledge. In this particular case, the research is “designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.”

The above examples are not meant to fully include or exclude all possibilities for each category, but are intended to clarify the most common situations that may be encountered.

Step Two: Determine if your research must be reviewed by the IRB.

After determining if your project qualifies as research, the next step is to determine if your research needs to be reviewed by IRB. If the research falls into any one of the categories below, then it must be submitted to IRB for review:

- a. The project is supported, in whole or in part, by funds or equipment provided by the Federal government, a State government, or any Federal or State governmental agency.
- b. The project encompasses research over which a Federal Department or Agency has specific responsibility for regulating as a research activity.

- c. The project involves human subjects taking part in biomedical or clinical research, or in behavioral research where the research activities reasonably could be expected to place participants at risk of physical or psychological harm. The determination of risk lies with each individual researcher.
- d. The project includes members of vulnerable populations who are relatively or absolutely incapable of protecting their interests. These populations include: 1) children; 2) individuals with questionable capacity to consent; 3) prisoners; 4) fetuses and pregnant women; 5) the terminally ill; 6) students and employees of USD; and 7) comatose patients.
- e. The project targets (not simply includes) a particular religious, racial, ethnic, or sexual-orientation population. (This criterion is included to ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of research according to the justice principle of the Belmont report.)
- f. The project is a type that the responsible University unit has specified to require IRB review and approval.
- g. The external funding source for the project has required that it be submitted for IRB review and approval.

Step Three: Determine which type of review category the research will fall under. The three categories are exempt, expedited, or full review.

Exempt Category:

It is important to note that research that qualifies as exempt must still be reviewed by the IRB. Research under the exempt category, however, requires only a brief proposal (see guidelines below). In general, the exempt category applies to analysis of pre-existing data that has been cleansed of all identifiers, or analysis of public records. According to federal regulations, research must meet one of the following conditions to fall into the exempt category:

1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human

- subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.
3. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
 4. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.
 5. Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.
 6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Items 1 through 4 are most likely to apply to research conducted through SOLES.

Expedited Review:

The majority of research proposals will qualify for expedited review. To qualify for expedited review, the research must present no more than minimal risk to participants. According to federal regulations, "minimal risk means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests." Any research involving prisoners, even if presenting only minimal risk, is required to go through full review.

Full Review:

Any research that presents more than minimal risk will be required to go through full review. In addition, any research involving prisoners is required to go through full review.

Step Four: Complete the Cover Sheet for the Proposal

The IRB application can be downloaded as a WORD document. The first part of the application is the cover sheet, which must be completed for all IRB projects (see attached sample). Filling out the cover sheet is generally straightforward. Under the review category (item 3), be sure to include under what category the research qualifies for either exempt or expedited review. The categories for exempt review are listed above under Step Two. The categories for expedited review are listed in the attachment entitled Categories of Research That May Be Reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) through an Expedited Review Procedure. For most research conducted through SOLES, category 7 will be the likely category under which it qualifies for expedited review.

Step Five: Complete the RESEARCH PLAN for the Proposal

Exempt Reviews:

Write a succinct description of the proposed research. Be sure to include the following in your description:

1. Who are the subjects and how will you recruit them?
2. What will subjects do or how will you interact with the subjects?
3. What steps will you take to assure that participation is voluntary?
4. Exempt reviews must also include one copy of each of the following:
 - a. Consent form (if applicable)
 - b. Copies of all brochures, flyers, advertisements for recruiting (if applicable)
 - c. Research questionnaire(s)/survey(s) (if applicable)
 - d. Experimental stimuli (if applicable)

Expedited and Full Reviews:

Complete the Research Plan portion of the application that can be downloaded as a Word document (see attached sample). The document provides guidelines for completing each of the sections, and should be followed carefully. I would like to offer the following guidelines to supplement those already offered on the application:

1. What steps will you take to assure that participation is voluntary? In addition to the guidelines stated in the document, it is important that the researcher address dual relationship between the researcher and participants. For example, a boss asking his or her subordinates to participate in research may create a situation where the individuals may feel hesitant to say no due to the position of power that the researcher/boss has over them. In a similar manner, students may be reluctant to say no to the researcher if he or she is also in a position of power over them as a teacher. Every effort should be made to avoid these dual relationships. If the dual relationship cannot be avoided, the proposal should make explicit why this is essential to the design, and what steps have been made to address this concern.
2. Statement of Risk/Benefit Ratio. In addition to stating yes or no, be sure to give an explanation as to why the benefits outweigh the risks. In your explanation, be explicit in stating potential benefits to the research participants (if any). If there are none, explicitly say there are none.
3. Protection of Confidentiality. It is important to note that in qualitative research, the use of pseudonyms may not be sufficient to protect confidentiality. With the small number of participants in a study, the content of a quote or description could potentially reveal an individual's identify. Therefore, the proposal should include a statement to the effect that the content of the quotes or descriptions will be reviewed (and changed if necessary) to make certain they do not inadvertently reveal the identity of the participant.
4. Informed Consent/Assent. Several issues must be addressed in writing the consent form and the section on informed consent. They include the following
 - a. Is the consent form written in clear and appropriate language? For example, is the consent form free of jargon or academic terms that may not be understood by the reader? Is the consent form at a reading level appropriate for the intended research participants?
 - b. If the study is likely to include individuals who do not speak English as their primary language, how will this be handled in terms of consent? Will consent forms in their language be provided? Or, will they be excluded from the study?
 - c. Does the consent form address all the important ingredients for informed consent?

Guidelines and Required Elements of Informed Consent is attached, and is also available on the USD IRB website. In addition, a *Sample Consent Form Template* is also attached and available on the USD IRB website. Following the template will help assure that all the necessary ingredients to consent have been addressed. However, I have changed the last line of the second paragraph to begin as follows, "If you decide not to participate or decide to quit, nothing...." In addition, if you are going to audiotape or videotape interviews or other research

interactions, be sure to make this explicit in the consent form. The Sample Consent Form does not include this.

- d. If minors are included in the study, does the proposal include both a consent form (signed by parents/guardians) and an assent form (signed by minors)? Is the assent form written so that is understandable by minors?
- e. Does the proposal clearly state how individuals will signify consent? For example, how will the researcher obtain informed consent where the researcher does not have face-to-face contact with the participant (making it more difficult to get a signed consent form)?
- f. If you are going to use an anonymous survey (e.g., questionnaire, web-based survey like Survey Monkey), then the first question of the survey should ask if the individual has read the informed consent and consents to participate in the survey. This makes it explicit that the participant agrees to participate in the study.

Appendices. The research plan specifies various materials (e.g., surveys, letters of support, consent form) that should be included as attachments. Please make sure the proposal is complete by including all the necessary appendices:

Expedited reviews must include one copy of each of the following:

1. Consent form (if applicable)
2. Copies of all brochures, flyers, advertisements for recruiting (if applicable)
3. Research questionnaire(s)/survey(s) (if applicable)
4. Letters of support (if applicable)
5. IRB approval from other institution(s) (if applicable)

Full reviews must include one copy of each of the following:

1. Consent form
2. Assent Form (must be included within the proposal if research subjects are 17 years of age or younger and must be written in age-appropriate language)
3. Copies of all brochures, flyers, advertisements for recruiting (if applicable)
4. Research questionnaire(s)/survey(s) (if applicable)
5. Letters of support (if applicable)
6. Permission from the research facility (if applicable)
7. IRB approval from other institution(s) (if applicable)

Step Six: Assemble Proposal and Necessary Documentation

In addition to the formal application (cover sheet and research plan), be sure to include all the other necessary documentation. This includes the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Investigator Checklist (completed and signed) and copies of the signed Investigator Training Certificate. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Investigator Checklist is part of the IRB proposal that can be downloaded as a Word document. There must be an

Investigator Training Certificate for each researcher on the project. The Investigator Training Certificate does not need to be included if the researcher has one already on file with the IRB (from a previous proposal).

Step Seven: Obtaining approval of proposals.

The following steps should be followed in terms of getting IRB approval:

1. For students doing research, have your faculty advisor review, approve, and sign the proposal.
2. Submit the proposal to Elaine Poue-En epoue-en@sandiego.edu 619-260-7475). She will log the proposal in and make sure it is forwarded to the appropriate individuals for review.
3. The SOLES IRB representative will be the first individual to review the proposal. The SOLES
4. representative will contact you directly if he or she has any questions or requested revisions.
5. After the SOLES IRB representative has signed off, it will be forwarded to the Associate Dean for approval as the Dean's representative. The Associate Dean will contact researchers if any changes are required.

After the Associate Dean's signature, proposals that qualify for exempt and expedited review will be forwarded to the Provost Office (Dr. Tom Herrinton) for final approval. You will hear directly from the Provost Office as to whether or not your research has been approved or requires any modifications. If your proposal requires full review, then you will need to make 16 copies of the proposal and deliver them to the Provost Office by 5:00 pm of the submission deadline. The IRB website posts the deadlines and meeting times for full reviews. Please note that the committee has traditionally not met during the month of August, so researchers should plan accordingly when submitting a full review during that time.

Categories of Research That May Be Reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) through an Expedited Review Procedure

Applicability

1. Research activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures listed in one or more of the following categories, may be reviewed by the IRB through the expedited review procedure authorized by 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. The activities listed should not be deemed to be of minimal risk simply because they are included on this list. Inclusion on this list merely means that the activity is eligible for review through the expedited review procedure when the

specific circumstances of the proposed research involve no more than minimal risk to human subjects.

2. The categories in this list apply regardless of the age of subjects, except as noted.
3. The expedited review procedure may not be used where identification of the subjects and/or their responses would reasonably place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects= financial standing, employability, insurability, reputation, or be stigmatizing, unless reasonable and appropriate protections will be implemented so that risks related to invasion of privacy and breach of confidentiality are no greater than minimal.
4. The expedited review procedure may not be used for classified research involving human subjects.
5. IRBs are reminded that the standard requirements for informed consent (or its waiver, alteration, or exception) apply regardless of the type of review--expedited or convened--utilized by the IRB.
6. Categories one (1) through seven (7) pertain to both initial and continuing IRB review.

Research Categories

1. Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) or (b) is met.
 - a. Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21 CFR Part 312) is not required. (Note: Research on marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the product is not eligible for expedited review.)
 - b. Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application (21 CFR Part 812) is not required; or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling.
2. Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:
 - a. from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; or
 - b. from other adults and children², considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may

not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

3. Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means.

Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a nondisfiguring manner; (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat); (e) uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gum base or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings; (j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

4. Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.)

Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject's privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c) magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

5. Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

6. Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.
7. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)
8. Continuing review of research previously approved by the convened IRB as follows:
 - a. where (i) the research is permanently closed to the enrollment of new subjects; (ii) all subjects have completed all research-related interventions; and (iii) the research remains active only for long-term follow-up of subjects; or
 - b. where no subjects have been enrolled and no additional risks have been identified; or
 - c. where the remaining research activities are limited to data analysis.
9. Continuing review of research, not conducted under an investigational new drug application or investigational device exemption where categories two (2) through eight (8) do not apply but the IRB has determined and documented at a convened meeting that the research involves no greater than minimal risk and no additional risks have been identified.

An expedited review procedure consists of a review of research involving human subjects by the IRB chairperson or by one or more experienced reviewers designated by the chairperson from among members of the IRB in accordance with the requirements set forth in 45 CFR 46.110. 2 Children are defined in the HHS regulations as "persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted." 45 CFR 46.402(a). Source: 63 FR 60364-60367, November 9, 1998.

International Course Proposals

For SOLES Global course proposals, please view the procedures on the SOLES Global Center Website: <http://www.sandiego.edu/soles/centers-and-research/global-center/resources/faculty/>

Faculty Load Policy

It is the policy of the School of Leadership and Education Sciences that the normal full-time load for teaching faculty is nine semester units in the fall and six semester units in the spring, commonly referred to as a 3/2 teaching load or six semester units in the fall and nine semester units in the spring or a 2/3 teaching load (15 units during an academic year). Overload will be accumulated after the 15th semester unit during an academic year. Teaching load reductions may be granted for serving in specified administrative roles or for other reasons when approved in advance by the Dean. In addition to regular instruction, teaching faculty are also responsible for professional responsibilities in support of the university mission, research, and professional development. For the purposes of calculating faculty load, online courses and residential courses are counted as equivalent.

Load Forms

At the beginning of each semester, you will be asked to complete a Faculty Load Form that can be found, with complete instructions, on the web at:

<http://www.sandiego.edu/soles/forms/faculty-load/index.php>

The form will be submitted electronically— please do not submit a hard copy. The form should be completed by the end of the first week of the semester.

Merit Pay Process

The Dean makes recommendations to the Provost in February after reviewing the Annual Faculty Planning and Evaluation Reports and after examining relative School-wide performance of faculty members so that inequities do not arise among faculty members with similar historical patterns of achievement. A percentage system has been used in the School with an explicit, targeted range for each recommending category, (e.g. 2-3% for average/satisfactory and 3-4% for above average). This is dependent on the university's approved annual percentage increase.

The first criterion, teaching, is key to our mission and is prominent in support of a strong merit pay recommendation. With regard to service to the program or department, the Dean will seek input from the Department Chairs. Please note: USD does not have an automatic cost of living increase.

A review of recommendations the last several years suggests the following profile for "typical" performance in the two following categories:

1. Average/satisfactory: The faculty member was an organized and effective instructor, accessible to students, and continued to be current in teaching fields. The faculty member had an active research agenda. Service in the program was reliable, and attendance at program meetings was regular; the faculty member may have served on a School or University-wide committee or two or been involved in community service activities or professional associations. Support of the University mission and a sense of responsibility were in evidence.
2. Above average: The faculty member was a demanding instructor with high intellectual standards, a demonstrated ability to motivate students, and a creative/adaptable pedagogy. The faculty member had one or more scholarly or research accomplishments that reached an audience of peers beyond the University. Service in the program was reliable, and attendance at program and department meetings was regular; the faculty member will have served at least one SOLES or University-wide committee or two, or been involved in community service activities. Leadership in faculty governance, program administration or professional associations was demonstrated; significant community service activities also may have been noted. Clear support of the University mission and a sense of responsibility were in evidence.

The above profiles were developed inductively. Some faculty may receive no merit increase or well below average, below average or well above average recommendations, but no attempts are made to infer patterns from these smaller number of cases. The description above of "typical" performance is not designed to determine merit decision-making; there are a myriad of variations, and there are factors-such as being a new faculty member or on leave-that can affect substantially how judgments are made regarding annual performance. The above profiles have, then, mostly heuristic value. Of primary importance in the merit pay process is the development of recommendations which are fully cognizant of the four criteria and which are supported by rationales and evidence.

Mileage Reimbursement

Faculty members who perform off-site supervision are eligible for mileage reimbursement. Please go to the Accounts Payable Website to access the Expense Report form at: <http://www.sandiego.edu/finance/accounts-payable/Forms.php>. Along with the expense report form, you will also need to complete the mileage form (Scroll down to the miscellaneous forms section). Under "Travel Description," note the names of the school visited and the student supervised. Requests must be submitted no later than 60 days after the supervision was performed. To ensure compliance with this policy, reimbursement requests should be submitted twice a semester.

New Academic Initiatives

Academic initiatives which are consonant with the University of San Diego and SOLES' mission are encouraged. In order to maintain academic standards and avoid administrative surprises and difficulties, all new academic programs must be reviewed and approved by various offices on campus. Please visit the Provost's website for the most current Academic Program Approval Form and Budget Worksheet. <http://www.sandiego.edu/provost/docs-forms/academic-initiatives-procedures.php>

Non-tenured Faculty Voting in SOLES Meetings

Benefits-based non-tenure track positions with curriculum related responsibilities, as well as Center Directors, will be eligible to vote on curriculum issues. These positions will be listed at the beginning of every school year in the Faculty Handbook. This policy will remain in effect as long as the designees do not make up more than 25% of those eligible to vote.

For the 2014-2015 Academic Year the Positions Are:

Director of Center for Educational Policy and Law (Scott Himelstein) Director(s) of ELDA (Janice Cook, Peg Basom)
Director of Field Experiences, Department of Learning & Teaching (Helene Mandell)
Director of Field Experiences, Department of School, Family, & Mental Health Professions (Peggy Hetherington)
Director of the Institute for Nonprofit Education and Research (Pat Libby)
Director of the Nonprofit Leadership and Management Certificate and Coordinator of the Leadership Studies Minor (Teresa VanHorn)
Professor in Residence (Frank Kemerer)
Coordinator of the Master of Arts in Leadership Studies (Zachary Green)

Practicum & Fieldwork Compensation

Counseling

COUN 588P (Sec. 01, 02) (3 units) (School practicum) (min. 3 / max 6 students per section)
COUN 590F (3 units) (Fieldwork in School Settings – limit 10 students)

COUN 587P (Clinical Mental Health Practicum) (3 Units)
COUN 597F, 598F (Clinical Mental Health Practicum II & III) (3 Units each)

Instructor for seminar 587, 597, 598 – 3 units (min 3 / max 7 students per section)
Individual Clinical Supervision: 1/2 instructional unit/student or .50 or 2 students =
1 unit

Department of Learning and Teaching

.65 instructional unit/student

EDUC 551P, 552P (MCC MS, SS Student Teaching) (2-6 units)
EDUC 490P/590P, 491P/591P (9 units) (Grad Credential Student Teaching MS, SS)
EDSP 490P/590P, 491P/591P (1-6 units) (Student Teaching)

.25 instructional unit/student

EDUC 332P/532P
EDUC 334P/534P
EDUC 549P
EDUC 375P/575P
EDUC 383P/583P
EDUC 385P/585P
EDSP 375P/575P

Leadership Studies

LEAD 598 – Masters Internship
LEAD 590, 593 (Masters internship)
LEAD 590, 593 (Non-profit leadership alliance internship)
LEAD 698 591, 592 (Doctoral internship)

6/10 instructional unit/student or .6 or 5 students = 3 units

LEAD 597P, 598P (Practicum in School Administration I & II) (3 Units)
for supervision of students in their first three semesters 1/2 instructional unit/student or .
5 or 6 students = 3 units
for supervision of students in their final semesters 3/5 instructional unit/student or . 6 or 5
students = 3 units

Marital and Family Therapy

MFTS 595P, 596P, 597P (5 units) (practicum)
Instructor for seminar (didactic) – 1 unit (for all full-time faculty each semester)
Small Group Instruction (max 6) – 2 units
Individual Supervision:
Full Time Faculty: 1/3 unit/student or .33 or 3 students = 1 unit

Part Time Faculty: 1/6 unit/student or .16 or 6 students = 1 unit

Sabbatical Leave

Please see the complete Sabbatical Leave Policy as it appears in the USD Policies and Procedures manual, available at <http://www.sandiego.edu/legal/upolicies.php>.

Disabilities

<http://www.sandiego.edu/disability>

If a professor has a disability, he/she is encouraged to notify the Department Chair, Dean's office or Human Resources so support and/or accommodations can be made.

Disability Services

Disability Services at USD assists enrolled students with disabilities in achieving equal access through specific accommodations for which they are eligible. Under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (see p. 35), individuals with disabilities are guaranteed certain protections and rights to equal access to programs and services. In order to access these rights, a student must self-identify and present documentation indicating that the disability substantially limits one or more major life activities, including learning. USD's Disability Services is responsible for securing and maintaining this documentation as it relates to the disability claims of each student who chooses to identify himself/herself. Certain disabilities, such as mobility impairments, blindness, and deafness, are often readily observable and, therefore, do not require complicated documentation.

The majority of students with disabilities, however, struggle with less physically obvious signs: low vision; hearing loss; learning disabilities; attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; psychiatric disabilities; chronic health/medical concerns, such as diabetes, cancer, epilepsy, heart disease, HIV, or AIDS. These students require more extensive documentation. All students must submit current documentation to Disability Services from a qualified physician, psychiatrist, psychologist, learning disabilities specialist, or other licensed professional that discusses explicit connections between the functional limitations specific to the disability and evidence to establish a rationale supporting the need for suggested accommodations. Once the disability has been verified by Disability Services, it is the student's responsibility, with assistance from Disability Services, to arrange recommended accommodations with individual faculty members, e.g., accommodated administration of tests/exams; taping of lectures. Each request and/or recommendation for an accommodation is examined on a case-by-case basis and is implemented at the discretion of the Director of Disability Services after meeting with the student and assessing his/her present needs.

It is the goal of Disability Services to promote maximum student independence. For questions specific to documentation for students with Learning Disabilities and/or Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton, NJ has a Web site that addresses requirements to which many colleges and universities are beginning to adhere: <http://www.ets.org/disability>. USD is not responsible for the provision of support services if the student has not self-identified and submitted the required documentation to Disability Services, Serra Hall, Room 300. Disability Services can be reached by calling **(619)260-4655**. Additionally, information may be found on USD's website at <http://www.sandiego.edu/disability>.

Take into consideration the following:

- Disability Services in Serra Hall, Room 300 needs to be the first place where students with disabilities go if they want to be accommodated in their classes. As a faculty member, you are under no obligation to accommodate if the student has not submitted official documentation to Disability Services and has not presented you with a memo from the Director that outlines the appropriate accommodations for that course. You would be doing yourself, and the student, a huge favor by including on your syllabus a statement similar to the following:
“Students with disabilities who believe that they may need accommodations in the class are encouraged to contact Disability Services in Serra Hall 300 (619) 260-4655 as soon as possible to better ensure that such accommodations are implemented in a timely fashion.”
- Confidentiality of all disability information is essential. At no time should the class be informed that a student has a disability, except at the student's express request. All disability information that the student gives to the faculty member is to be used specifically for arranging reasonable accommodations for the course of study.
- Provide students with a detailed course syllabus that is available before registration.
- If possible, select a textbook with an accompanying study guide for optional student use.
- Clearly spell out expectations at the beginning of the courses (e.g., grading, material to be covered, due dates).
- Announce reading assignments well in advance for students who are using taped materials or other alternative formats. It takes an average of six weeks to get a book tape-recorded.
- Start each lecture with an outline of material to be covered that period. At the conclusion of class, briefly summarize key points.

- Speak directly to students, and use gestures and natural expressions to convey further meaning.
- Give assignments both orally and in written form to avoid confusion.
- Facilitate use of tape recorders for note taking by allowing students to tape lectures.
- Provide adequate opportunities for questions and answers, including review sessions.
- Provide study questions for exams that demonstrate the format of the test, as well as study questions on content. Explain what constitutes a good answer and why.
- Allow students with disabilities requiring alternate testing formats to demonstrate mastery of course material using methods appropriate to the student and the subject matter (e.g., extended time limits for testing, taped exams, tests that combine formats, such as multiple choice, essay, and short answer).
- Permit use of basic 4-function calculators, scratch paper, and spellers' dictionaries during exams.
- Encourage students to use campus support services.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 states, "No otherwise qualified person with a disability in the United States...shall, solely by reason of...disability, be denied benefits of, be excluded from participation in, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."

A "person with a disability" includes "any person who (i) has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person's major life activities; (ii) has a record of such an impairment; or (iii) is regarded as having such an impairment."

A "qualified person with a disability" is defined as one who meets the requisite academic and technical standards required for admission or participation in the post secondary institution's programs and activities. Section 504 protects the civil rights of individuals who are qualified to participate and who have disabilities.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) is the civil rights guarantee for person with disabilities in the United States. It provides protection from discrimination for individuals on the basis of disability. The ADA extends civil rights protection for people with disabilities to employment in the public and private sectors, transportation, public accommodations, services provided by state and local government, and telecommunication relay services.

A “person with a disability” is anyone with a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, such as caring for one’s self, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and working. In addition to those people who have visible disabilities—persons who are blind, deaf, or use a wheelchair - the definition includes people with a whole range of invisible disabilities. These include psychological problems, learning disabilities, or some chronic health impairment such as epilepsy, diabetes, arthritis, cancer, cardiac problems, HIV/AIDS, and others.

Standards for Graduate Students

The standards below were drafted as part of a “Statement on Graduate Students” by a subcommittee of the Association’s Committee C on College and University Teaching, Research, and Publication and approved for publication by Committee C in October 1999.

1. Graduate students have the right to academic freedom. Like other students, “they should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course or study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but they are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled.”¹ Moreover, their advanced education particularly requires faculty to encourage their freedom of “discussion, inquiry and expression.”² Further, they should be able to express their opinions freely about matters of institutional policy, and they should have the same freedom of action in the public political domain as faculty members.

Graduate students’ freedom of inquiry is necessarily qualified by their being learners in the profession; nonetheless, their faculty mentors should afford them latitude and respect as they decide in how they will engage in teaching and research.

2. Graduate students have the right to be free from illegal or unconstitutional discrimination, or discrimination on a basis not demonstrably related to the job function involved, including, but not limited to, age, sex, disability, race, religion, national origin, marital status, or sexual orientation, in admissions and throughout their education, employment and placement.³

They should be informed of the requirements of their degree programs. When feasible, they should be told about acceptance, application, and attrition rates in their fields, but it is also their responsibility to keep themselves informed. If requirements are altered, students admitted under previous rules should be able to continue under those rules.

Institutions should help students make progress toward their degrees in a timely fashion. They should provide diligent advisers, relevant course offerings, adequate

dissertation or thesis supervision, and clear communication of their progress. Students should understand that dissertation or thesis work may be constrained by the areas of interest and specialization of available faculty supervisors.

If a student's dissertation or thesis adviser departs once the student's work is underway, the responsible academic officers should endeavor to provide the student with alternative supervision, external to the institution if necessary. If a degree program is to be discontinued, provisions must be made for students already in the program to complete their course of study.

3. Graduate students are entitled to the recognition and protection of their intellectual property rights. This includes recognition of their participation in supervised research and the research of faculty. Standards of attribution and acknowledgement in collaborative settings should be made publicly available.¹
¹ "Joint statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students" Policy Documents and Reports, 8th ed. (Washington, D.C.: Ibid.
4. Graduate students should have a voice in institutional governance at the program, department, college, graduate school, and university levels.
5. The AAUP's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure protects graduate assistants and assures them of written terms of appointment, due process in the event of proposed dismissal, and the opportunity to invoke "access to the faculty grievance committee."⁴ Graduate student employees with grievances, as individuals or as a group, should submit them in a timely fashion and should have access to an impartial hearing committee or, if provided under institutional policy, arbitration. Clear guidelines and timelines for grievance procedures should be distributed to all interested parties. Individuals or participants in a group grievance should not be subjected to reprisals. Graduate student employees may choose a representative to speak for them at all stages of a grievance.
6. Graduate student assistants should be informed in writing of the conditions of their employment. Moreover, graduate student assistants should be informed of all academic or other institutional regulations affecting their roles as employees.

Good practices should include appropriate training in teaching, adequate office space, and a safe working environment. Departments should endeavor to acquaint students with the norms and traditions of their academic discipline and to inform them of professional opportunities. Graduate students should feel free to seek departmental assistance in obtaining future academic and nonacademic employment. Departments are encouraged to provide support for the professional development of graduate students by such means as funding research expenses and conference travel.

7. Graduate students should have access to their files and placement dossiers. If access is denied, graduate students should feel free to request that a faculty member of their

choice be given access to their files, so that he or she can provide the student with a redacted account at his or her discretion. Graduate students should have the right to direct that items be added to or removed from their placement dossiers.

8. Like all other campus employees, graduate student assistants should have the right to organize to bargain collectively without discrimination or reprisal from faculty or administrators, as the Association's Council affirmed in November 1998. Administrations should honor a majority request for union representation. Graduate student assistants must not suffer retaliation because of their activity relating to collective bargaining.
9. In order to ensure full-time students an opportunity for timely progress toward their degrees, the time spent in teaching or research assistantships or other graduate student employment provided by the institution should be limited in amount – a common maximum is twenty hours per week – and should afford sufficient compensation so as not to compel the student to obtain substantial additional employment elsewhere.
⁴ "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure," Ibid.
10. Graduate student assistants, though they only work part-time, should receive essential fringe benefits, and especially health benefits.

Travel Allotment Procedures

For the 2014-2015 academic year, all tenure line faculty have up to \$1500 for professional travel.

New tenure line faculty, (in their first three years of service), are eligible for additional support for up to two additional conferences in which they are presenting. Prior approval must be granted before the expenses are incurred. Travel expense forms, policies and procedures are available on USD's website (<http://www.sandiego.edu/finance/accounts-payable/>). The budget year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30.

Department Chairs (Leadership, Learning and Teaching and School, Family and Mental Health Professions) are eligible for additional travel monies due to their programmatic responsibilities. Additional travel support requires prior written permission from the dean. Please send requests to the dean and she will respond to you and to the Budget and Operations Manager.

Please submit your travel expense forms within 60 days of the completion of your travel. Submittals made after this time frame will not be processed. If your travel is toward the end of the fiscal year, please be sure to turn in your expense form as quickly as possible and no later than the last week of June. If the forms are submitted after the fiscal year closes, the upcoming year's allocations will be used for reimbursement.

Faculty Presenting with Students at Conferences

Faculty should apply to the Enhanced Faculty Student Interaction grant (EFSI) in the Provost's office for up to \$500 to support student-faculty groups to present at a professional conference. Please see the Provost's office website for details.

The SOLES Graduate Student Association (SGSA) also provides support for students to travel to conferences. Before seeking support from the student's home department or SOLES Dean's office, students must first apply to SGSA for support. Once this application is made, then a student or a group of students, may submit a request to the home department to help support their expenses. The faculty member should be copied on this request. Students should provide an itemized estimate that includes travel and conference expenses, as well as the names and email addresses of all students making the request. If funding is not available at the department level, then the request may be submitted to the Dean's office for consideration. Funding is awarded as available and dependent upon level of student involvement. Please note that requests must be submitted and approved prior to conference attendance. Funding requests submitted after an event will not be considered.

Travel Guidelines (For Student Clubs and Groups)

General Guidelines:

- I. All events that involve student travel must be approved in writing by the Dean, or the Dean's designated representative for travel issues.
- II. All vendors conducting business on behalf of the university must sign a contract and provide a certificate of insurance, with an attached endorsement naming USD as the additional insured. There will be no exceptions to this requirement. All certificates with the attached endorsements should be copied and sent to the Risk Manager in Human Resources.
- III. All USD registered clubs and organizations planning to have an event off campus which involves providing transportation in USD vehicles for students must have those students sign a waiver releasing the University from any liability for the student off campus. Waiver forms are available in the Office of Student Affairs on Mondays – Fridays, 8:00am – 5:00pm. Trip applicants may not leave campus unless a signed waiver is received. The signed waivers are to be given to the Office of Student Affairs prior to departure from campus.

- A. Student waivers are only used for “voluntary” participants. If the trip is a course requirement no waiver can be obtained.
- IV. A list which includes the name, I.D. number, address and emergency phone number of each student traveling and a copy of the final trip itinerary must be given to the Office of Student Affairs and to Campus Security prior to departure from campus.
- V. All transportation companies used (chartered buses, rental cars, etc.) must carry insurance. A certificate of insurance from the vendor’s carrier with an attached endorsement naming USD as additional insured must be given to the Office of Student Affairs prior to departure from campus. If renting a vehicle for use with the United States, provide a copy of the rented vehicle proof of insurance form to the vendor and waive the insurance. Form is found on the Risk Management website.. If renting a vehicle with plans to take it into Mexico, register the trip and print the proof of insurance for Mexico as well as following the above advice for the in U.S. travel. The Mexico insurance link is also found on the Risk Management web site. Certificates and endorsements should always be attached to vendor contracts, and copies of the certificates forwarded to the risk manager.
- VI. State arrival and departure time clearly on all publicity and tickets sold. Students should be made aware that they are responsible for their own transportation if they are late for the previously stated departure time.
- VII. All contracts in relation to travel must be reviewed and approved by Kelly Douglas in General Counsel.

Automobile Transportation:

- 1. Use of personal automobiles for transportation exposes the owner and driver to considerable liability. For the protection of all involved, organizations and individuals contemplating auto travel should ensure:
 - A. Existence of current auto insurance and its applicability if drivers are rotated.
 - B. The proper licensing and eligibility of all drivers.
 - C. Observance of all traffic laws, particularly in regards to speed limits.
 - D. Availability and use of passenger restraints (seat belts).
 - E. NO consumption of alcohol and drugs, or medicine that would impair the ability to operate a vehicle.
 - F. The proper maintenance and operating condition of the vehicle, especially for long distances.
 - G. Availability of basic safety and repair equipment.

2. Operators of USD vehicles must possess a valid driver's license applicable to the type of vehicle to be driven.
3. Faculty should never assign students to specific vehicles if carpools using private vehicles.
4. When renting vehicles, it is preferred to use a USD T&E card.
5. When renting vehicles fully inspect the vehicle before leaving the rental agency for visible damages. Take pictures and note the damage on the rental form. Have the agent initial and date your notes. When turning in a vehicle, again inspect it for damage and have the receiving agent also inspect the vehicle and note the presence or absence of any damage before you leave the agency. This will protect you from being charged for pre-existing damage or false reports of the vehicle being returned with unreported damage.

Air Travel:

When selecting an air carrier for organizational travel, student organizations should be aware that the University would like them to use carriers which possess \$150 million of liability insurance. Major United States airlines carry this insurance and verification is not necessary. In the event a travel agency proposes the services of a charter company, an insurance certificate of \$150 million, with an attached endorsement naming USD as an additional insured is required. It is recommended all travelers purchase travel accident insurance. This will provide coverage if the individual's trip is cancelled at the last moment for personal or family health issues and provides some coverage for lost luggage and other benefits.

Bus Travel:

Bus travel is often used by student organizations as a means of transportation to and from sponsored activities. See the Risk Management website for instructions on accessing the safety rating for the company. Only use firms with a satisfactory rating. Bus travel is permitted on commercial bus companies which possess \$5 million of liability insurance and name USD as an additional insured. A current list of bus companies carrying this insurance is available in the Office of Student Affairs.

Travel Agents:

The agent should be made fully aware of all air travel and bus travel guidelines prior to negotiating trip arrangements.

The travel agency that the student organization works with should be informed that lodging facilities must be provided by a travel industry rating service (i.e. AAA Travel Guides, etc.). If this is not available, the lodging facility must possess \$1 million of liability insurance, certification of which must be submitted to the Office of Student Affairs.

Under no circumstances should money be sent directly by the student participants to the travel agency. All expenses must be paid by University check, which will be generated and sent to the travel agent once proper documentation and certification has been received and all necessary contracts have been signed. As with all programs, ticket sales should not commence until contracts have been signed.

International Travel Guidelines (Faculty)

When traveling internationally for work related purposes (conferences, training, research, professional development, teaching, etc.), it is important to notify the Coordinator at the SOLES Global Center prior to your departure date. The SOLES Global Center Coordinator must notify the appropriate USD departments to set up your international travel insurance coverage, and to provide you with the appropriate documents (travel insurance card, summary of benefits, claim forms, etc.) to take with you on your international travel. Faculty members need to communicate the following travel information in writing to the Coordinator: Dates of Travel, Destination, Purpose of travel (conference, sabbatical, teaching, professional development, etc.), and your contact information while abroad. This information is also located at the Global Center Faculty Resource website: http://www.sandiego.edu/soles/centers/global_center/resources/index.php

International Travel Guidelines (For Student Groups Led by Faculty)

In addition to obtaining approval in writing by the Dean for student travel, it is MANDATORY that the students sign the USD Agreement and Release form. This form may be obtained from the SOLES Global Center in MRH 129 or via the website under Faculty Resources: http://www.sandiego.edu/soles/centers/global_center/resources/index.php

Emergency Procedures:

Off Campus:

1. When an accident occurs and involves injuries or major damage, it should be immediately reported to the police agency having jurisdiction in the area of the accident and obtain emergency medical assistance as needed. Obtain information from the police as to how to obtain a copy of their report. As soon thereafter as feasible, it should be reported the University Office of Public Safety and to the Risk Manager in Human Resources who will obtain the necessary information required by the insurance company.
2. If an accident occurs involving minor damages with NO injuries, insurance information must be exchanged between vehicle operators and must include the following information:
 - name

- address
- telephone number
- driver's license number and expiration date
- name of insurance carrier and/or agent and policy number if known
- make, model and license number of vehicle
- date and location of accident
- names and contact information for all passengers in both vehicles
- names and contact information for any witnesses
- pictures of the damage to each vehicle

As soon as possible, forward all pertinent information regarding the accident to the Risk Manager in Human Resources.

3. Upon receipt of information concerning an accident involving a USD vehicle, the Risk Manager will forward all information to the University's insurance representative.

Accidents Involving Rental Vehicles:

In the event of an accident involving an uninsured loss with a rental vehicle, either locally or out of the area, the Risk Manager should be notified as soon as possible by telephone. Subsequently, a written report from the operator, as well as a report for the rental agency, including the amount of damages, should be sent to the Risk Manager. If the vehicle was rented using a USD credit card, notify the card company of the incident. They will request information from the driver and handle the damage claim. The Risk Manager may also process the claim if the damages exceed the card company's coverage. **Publicity:**

All registered USD clubs and organizations must follow these travel guidelines. Clubs and organizations that do not follow all scenarios of the guidelines will be subject to having publicly removed and/or scheduling privileges (which promote the event) revoked.

**Agreement and Release of Liability forms can be found in appendix B.*

University Professorships

Additional Information about University Professorships can be found on the website:
<http://www.sandiego.edu/provost/awards/professorships/>

Historical Perspective: The University Professorship was established by the Board of Trustees as a recommendation by Sister Sally Furay, Provost and Academic Vice President of USD. The award was established to recognize outstanding, balanced cumulative career contributions by a tenured Associate or Full Professor who clearly demonstrates the mission and goals of USD. The award carries both a certificate of recognition and a stipend (at present \$20,000). Besides peer recognition of cumulative service, the award was also

meant to offset the reality that USD does not provide a salary increment to faculty who reach the associate or full professorship rank. The honor is formally announced by the President at the Fall Faculty Convocation. University Professorships for eligible SOLES faculty are awarded every other year,

Present Award Composition: Only faculty who have been awarded tenure are eligible for a University Professorship Award. All SOLES tenure track faculty are eligible to vote for the SOLES Professorship Award recipient(s).

University Professorship: Recognition for outstanding, balanced cumulative career contributions supporting the mission and goals of USD. (Candidate must be nominated by a tenure track member of the School of Leadership and Education Sciences.)

- Process: Nomination by peer(s) by closing date of nominations. Peer provides a letter of rationale for the nomination based on the award criteria stated here.
 - Candidate may submit additional support material (maximum 5 pages) no later than the last working day prior to voting by the tenure faculty in SOLES.
- Timing: Professorship is held for one USD fiscal year (July 1-June 30).
- Finances: Flexible use of funds. For example: stipend and/or release time (taxable and benefit charges at the present rate of 5.47%), or other professional expenditures [travel, supplies or equipment (if equipment is used outside of university it is taxable)]. The recipient presents a proposed expenditure budget to the Dean at the beginning of the fiscal year and the expenditures are handled by the Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration.

School of Leadership and Education Sciences Professorship Committee: The Professorship Award Committee will consist of the recipients of the prior two years Professorship Awards; this is a committee of three. The chair of the committee will be one of the committee members in his/her second year on the award committee.

Guidelines for Submission: A nomination for a Professorship Recognition Award (1 to 2 pages) must be presented to the Dean's Executive Assistant. A faculty member nominated for a professorship recognition award will be invited to submit additional support materials (maximum 5 pages).

Procedures for Review of Documentation & Voting Review: The documentation for all professorship recognition based awards will be made available by the Dean's office. Faculty members are expected to review all documentation to make an informed decision about voting for candidates. Voting: The Dean's Executive Assistant will conduct the voting procedures. An envelope with the names of the tenure line faculty who are eligible to vote will be signed by each tenure track faculty member as they insert a ballot in a sealed envelope into the signature envelope. All Members of the Professorship Award Committee will jointly count the ballots.

Letters of Award: When awards are made, an award letter will be issued by the Dean with a copy to the Provost, specifying the amount and nature of the award (or incorporating by reference the proposal which has been approved), and notifying faculty of the procedures and time deadlines.

Professorships held by faculty members in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences:

- 1994 – 1995: Edward Kujawa – Recognition
- 1995 – 1996: Susan Zgliczynski – Project-based*
- 1996 – 1997: Robert Infantino – Recognition
JoEllen Patterson – Project-based*
- 1997 – 1998: Steven Gelb – Recognition
- 1998 – 1999: Kathryn Bishop-Smith – Recognition
Edward DeRoche – Project-based*
- 1999 – 2000: Mary Woods Scherr – Recognition
- 2000 – 2001: Steven Gelb – Project-based* Bobbi Hansen – Project-based*
- 2001 – 2002: Jerry Ammer – Recognition
- 2002 – 2003: Lee Williams – Recognition
Mary Williams – Project-based*
- 2003 – 2004: Viviana Alexandrowicz – Project-based*
- 2004 – 2005: Kenneth Gonzalez – Project-based* Bobbi Hansen – Recognition
- 2005 – 2006: Kathleen Collins – Project-based*
- 2006 – 2007: Lonnie Rowell – Recognition
JoEllen Patterson – Recognition
- 2007 – 2008: Reyes Quezada – Project-based*
- 2008 – 2009: Robert Donmoyer – Recognition
- 2009 – 2010: No Awards in SOLES (Alternate Year with SON)
- 2010 – 2011: Lea Hubbard – Recognition
- 2011 – 2012: No Awards in SOLES (Alternate Year with SON)
- 2012 – 2013: Fred Galloway – Recognition
- 2013 – 2014: No Awards in SOLES (Alternate Year with SON)
- 2014 – 2015: Nori Inoue – Recognition

**Project-Based Professorships are no longer awarded by the University.*

University Senate

The University Senate Bylaws and Policies can be found in the Policies and Procedures Manual on the University website: <http://www.sandiego.edu/legal/policies/>

University Policies

The University of San Diego has established six volumes of policies that are maintained on the Office of the General Counsel's website at: <http://www.sandiego.edu/legal/policies/>

Employees are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the policies. Following are links to each of the policies.

Volume I: Policies on Governance and Administration

- [1.1](#) Introduction
- [1.2](#) Mission Statement and Core Values
- [1.3](#) Vision Statement and 2011-16 Strategic Directions
- [1.4](#) Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of the University of San Diego
- [1.5](#) Constitution and By-Laws of the University of San Diego Senate
- [1.6](#) Code of Ethics

Volume II: Campus Community Policies

- [2.1](#) Introduction
- [2.2](#) General Institutional Policies
 - [2.2.1](#) Equal Opportunity
 - [2.2.2](#) Policy Prohibiting Discrimination and Harassment
 - [2.2.3](#) Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
 - [2.2.4](#) Reasonable Accommodations for Disabled Persons
 - [2.2.5](#) Policy Prohibiting Illegal, Dishonest or Fraudulent Conduct
 - [2.2.6](#) Individual Conflicts of Interest
 - [2.2.7](#) Record Retention Policy
 - [2.2.8](#) Use of University Name, Symbols and Other Property
 - [2.2.9](#) Diversity
 - [2.2.10](#) Policy Governing Assembly on Campus
 - [2.2.11](#) Policy on Consensual Relationships Between Employees and Students
 - [2.2.12](#) Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect
- [2.3](#) Health Related Policies
 - [2.3.1](#) Alcohol and Drug Policy
 - [2.3.2](#) Tobacco Policy (as of August 18, 2015, Smoking and Tobacco-Free Policy)
 - [2.3.3](#) Immunizations and Screening Tests
 - [2.3.4](#) Environmental Health and Safety
- [2.4](#) Campus Safety and Security Policies
 - [2.4.1](#) Clery Act
 - [2.4.2](#) Access to University Buildings, Facilities and Grounds
 - [2.4.3](#) Timely Warning Policy

- [2.4.4](#) Missing Student Notification Policy
- [2.5](#) Information Technology Policies
 - [2.5.1](#) Policy on Responsible Use of University Computing Resources
- [2.6](#) Public Affairs Policies
 - [2.6.1](#) Contact with the Media and Media on Campus
 - [2.6.2](#) Filming on University Property
 - [2.6.3](#) Guest Speakers
 - [2.6.4](#) Political Campaign Activities
- [2.7](#) Policies Governing Research
 - [2.7.1](#) Policy For Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct Involving Externally-Funded Research
 - [2.7.2](#) Protection of Human Subjects
 - [2.7.3](#) Financial Conflicts of Interest in Externally Funded Research
- [2.8](#) Intellectual Property Policies
 - [2.8.1](#) Intellectual Creativity
- [2.9](#) Risk Management Policies
 - [2.9.1](#) Reserved
 - [2.9.2](#) Reserved
 - [2.9.3](#) Reserved
 - [2.9.4](#) Reserved
 - [2.9.5](#) Drug and Alcohol Testing for Motor Vehicle Operators
- [2.10](#) Purchasing and Financial Policies
 - [2.10.1](#) Expense Reimbursement
 - [2.10.2](#) Purchasing
 - [2.10.3](#) Independent Contractors
 - [2.10.4](#) University Revenue Handling
 - [2.10.5](#) Contract Signature Authority Policy
- [2.11](#) Miscellaneous Campus Community Policies
 - [2.11.1](#) Animals on University Property

Volume III: General Institutional Employment Policies

- [3.1](#) Reserved
- [3.2](#) Commencement of Employment
 - [3.2.1](#) Employment of Relatives and Household Members
 - [3.2.2](#) Proof of Right to Work
 - [3.2.3](#) Relocation Assistance
 - [3.2.4](#) Background Checks
- [3.3](#) New Employee Orientation
- [3.4](#) Compensation

- 3.5** Wage and Hour Policies
 - 3.5.1** Working Hours and Workweek
 - 3.5.2** Paydays
 - 3.5.3** Payroll Deductions
 - 3.5.4** Pay Advances
 - 3.5.5** Exempt and Non-Exempt Status
 - 3.5.6** Overtime
 - 3.5.7** Make Up Time
 - 3.5.8** Alternative Workweek Schedules
 - 3.5.9** Meal Breaks and Rest Periods
 - 3.5.10** Time Records
- 3.6** Personnel Records and Personnel Information
- 3.7** Reserved
- 3.8** Workplace Standards
 - 3.8.1** Policy on Consensual Relationships Between Supervisors and Employees
- 3.9** Holidays, Vacation and Sick Time
 - 3.9.1** Holidays
 - 3.9.2** Vacations
 - 3.9.3** Sick Leave
- 3.10** Leaves of Absences
 - 3.10.1** Reasonable Accommodations, Transfers and Leaves for Employees Affected or Disabled by Pregnancy
 - 3.10.2** Family and Medical Leave
 - 3.10.3** Medical Leave
 - 3.10.4** Time Off for Voting
 - 3.10.5** Jury Duty
 - 3.10.6** Judicial Proceedings Leave
 - 3.10.7** Bereavement Leave
 - 3.10.8** Military Leave
 - 3.10.9** Military Spousal Leave
 - 3.10.10** Children's School Activities
 - 3.10.11** Organ and Bone Marrow Donation Leave
- 3.11** Benefits
 - 3.11.1** Benefits Policy
 - 3.11.2** Tuition Remission Policy
 - 3.11.3** Phased Retirement
 - 3.11.4** Post-Retirement Medical Reimbursement Benefit
 - 3.11.5** Other Retirement Benefits

[3.11.6](#) Adoption Expense Reimbursement Policy

[3.12](#) Employee Indemnification

Volume IV: Faculty Policies

[4.1](#) Academic Freedom

[4.2](#) Rank & Tenure: College, Business, SOLES, Nursing, Peace Studies and Engineering

[4.3](#) Rank & Tenure: School of Law

[4.4](#) Dismissal for Serious Cause

[4.5](#) Retrenchment

[4.6](#) Appeals from ARRT Decisions

[4.7](#) Sabbatical Leave

[4.8](#) Academic Integrity: College, Business, SOLES, Nursing, Peace Studies, Engineering

[4.9](#) School of Law Honor Code

[4.10](#) Faculty Membership Support

[4.11](#) Work Load

[4.12](#) Office Hours

[4.13](#) Outside Employment

[4.14](#) Emeritus Status

[4.15](#) Policy for Appointments to Endowed Chairs and Professorships

[4.16](#) Faculty Grievances

Volume VI: Academic Policies

[6.1](#) Discipline Accreditation / Approval

[6.2](#) Honorary Degrees

Volume XX: Policies and Procedures

[20](#) Policies and Procedures